

All rights Reserved.

OSCAR WILDE: THREE TIMES TRIED

“All trials are trials for one's life, just as all sentences are sentences of death; and THREE TIMES have I been TRIED. The first time I left the box to be arrested, the second time to be led back to the house of detention, the third time to pass into a prison for two years.”

De Profundis.

LONDON
THE FERRESTONE PRESS, LTD.
RED LION COURT
1906

NOTE

The only official report of the trials of Lord Queensberry and Oscar Wilde is to be found in Vol. cxxi, cxxii, parts 726-728, pages 531, 582 and 625 of the Central Criminal Court Sessions Papers of April, May and June, 1895. These books, which can be obtained of any law bookseller, profess to give "The whole proceedings on the Queen's Commission of Oyer and Terminer and Gaol Delivery for the City of London . . . within the jurisdiction of the Central Criminal Court," but the trials referred to occupy only a few lines each, not a single word of evidence being included.

A small volume published from Paris by Mr. Charles Carrington about 1905 contains an abridged report of a portion of Wilde's trial, but it is untrustworthy and misleading. No attempt has hitherto been made to bring together a complete and accurate account of this long and complicated case. Special care, it will be seen, has been devoted to the elucidation of abstruse legal points, cases being quoted for exemplification where necessary. The evidence of witnesses, together with the prolonged cross-examination of Wilde in each of the three trials, is given as fully as possible, with due regard to discretion. The foot-notes and appendix contain information which is now made public for the first time.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE - - - - -	vii
I.—THE FIRST TIME. Before MR. JUSTICE HENN COLLINS.	
i. The Libel Action against the Marquis of Queensberry - - -	1
ii. Lord Queensberry Charged Magisterial Decision - - -	4
iii. The Trial of Lord Queensberry at the Old Bailey - - - -	15
iv. Lord Queensberry at the Old Bailey (continued) - - - -	63
v. Conclusion of the Case and Verdict - - - - -	116
vi. Sequel to the Old Bailey Proceedings. Oscar Wilde Arrested	128
II.—THE SECOND TIME. Before MR. JUSTICE CHARLES	
vii. Oscar Wilde in Custody. Proceedings at Bow Street - - -	141
viii. The Second Day at Bow Street - - -	160
ix. Committed for Trial - - - -	176
x. The Trial of Oscar Wilde and Alfred Taylor at the Old Bailey	187
xi. The Second Day of the Trial - -	214

CONTENTS

		PAGE
xii.	The Third Day of the Trial -	244
xiii.	The Fourth Day, Conspiracy Charges Withdrawn - - -	258
xiv.	Conclusion of the Trial - - -	295
xv.	Oscar Wilde Released on Bail - -	319
 III.— THE THIRD TIME. Before MR. JUSTICE WILLS		
xvi.	The Trial of Alfred Taylor -	329
xvii.	Second Day of the Trial of Alfred Taylor - - - - -	349
xviii.	The Marquis of Queensberry and Lord Douglas of Hawick - -	373
xix.	The Final Trial of Oscar Wilde -	378
xx.	The Second Day of the Last Trial	396
xxi.	For the Defence - - - -	408
xxii.	The Last Day - - - -	437
PETITIONS	- - - - -	467
INDEX	- - - - -	473-480

PREFACE

“Once in six or seven years,” wrote Macaulay, “our virtue becomes outrageous.” It was never more outrageous than in its ecstatic horror over Oscar Wilde. Even now we are only beginning to recover from that amazing outburst, and to replace Wilde’s books on our unlocked bookshelves. It has taken over fifteen long years to disembarrass the man’s literature from his life. In the interval his personality has been almost buried under the mud of the moralists, and his name surrounded by a vague fog of obscenity in which truths, already sufficiently repulsive, have been covered by inventions even more hateful. Unfortunately no accurate record of Oscar Wilde’s trial exists. More or less garbled accounts may, of course, be discovered in contemporary newspapers, and numerous references, frequently misleading, in biographies of Wilde; but so far there has been no attempt to give a fair picture of the trial, to show how he was accused, who were his accusers and in what manner they comported themselves in the witness-box. Such a picture is now necessary for two main reasons. First, for the sake of clearing the

man's figure from the filthy web of lies which has entangled it ; in comparison with which the bald truth —ugly as it is—seems almost clean. Secondly, for the sake of Wilde's literary work.

For fifteen years everything that virtuous hatred could do to belittle a dead man's work has been done, and has failed utterly. To-day Wilde's literary and dramatic genius is demanding recognition afresh and is moving irresistibly to its place in English literature. In the next few years numerous efforts will assuredly be made to read the riddle of his strange life and to divorce it finally from his writings. As a means to that end this book is offered. By its aid Wilde's sins against society may be weighed, condemned—if condemnation be now necessary—and laid aside. For too long his work has been interpreted through one phase of his life; has been read under the black shadow of his great offence. But the books he wrote are now being opened afresh and it is essential that they come before us for literary judgment free from anything useless and external.

This book, by defining the scope and result of the trial, will enable choice to be made between ugly fact and baser fiction. The subject cannot be pleasant, but need not be prolonged. Fifteen years' boycott by the preservers of our national morality has quite failed to destroy Wilde's work and influence. We ought, then, to cease looking at his work from ~~between~~ our fingers. The better plan will be to define clearly

what was unworthy in his life and then, cutting it away, accord his works whatever position in our literature they can hold. The increasing interest in Wilde, both in England and America, makes such a task urgent, and it is as an aid to that task that this book is published.

Incidentally, this story of a great trial throws sidelights on Wilde and his contemporaries not to be found elsewhere, and supplies unique material for the study of a personality, complex, exquisite and sordid, which, after fifteen years, is triumphing over the execration of a whole nation -- periodically moral.

I.—THE FIRST TIME

' The first time I left the box to be arrested

THREE TIMES TRIED

1.—THE FIRST TIME

i.—THE LIBEL ACTION AGAINST THE MARQUIS OF QUEENSBERRY

On Saturday, March 2nd, 1895, John Sholto Douglas, eighth Marquis of Queensberry, was at Marlborough Street Police Court, London, charged on a warrant with publishing a certain libel concerning Mr. Oscar Fingall O'Flahertie Wills Wilde.

The presiding magistrate was Mr. Robert Milnes Newton. Mr. Charles Octavius Humphreys (of the firm of C. O. Humphreys, Son, and Kershaw, of Giltspur Chambers, Holborn Viaduct, E.C.) prosecuted. Sir George Lewis appeared for the defence.

Mr. Humphreys, in opening the case, said that Mr. Oscar Wilde was a married man living on the most affectionate terms with his wife and family of two sons. He had been the object of a most cruel persecution at the hands of Lord Queensberry. Ten months ago his client had consulted him on the matter, but in consequence of family affairs Mr. Oscar Wilde was very unwilling to take any steps of a criminal nature. Mr. Wilde was a member of the Albemarle Club,* where both ladies and gentlemen

* 13, Albemarle Street, Piccadilly, W.

were admitted. Mrs. Wilde was also a member of the club. On the previous Thursday night (February 28th) Mr. Oscar Wilde went to this club, and the hall porter presented him with a card enclosed in an envelope addressed "Oscar Wilde, Esq." He explained that a gentleman had called and requested that the card should be handed to Mr. Oscar Wilde. The porter, being astonished at what was written on the card, considered it of sufficient importance to add the date and hour when the card was left, and he wrote on it, "4.30, 18th February, 1895." Mr. Humphreys said that he could not conceive a more frightful, serious or abominable libel for one man to publish about another. He proposed to go into other cases which had occurred before February 18th, and after they had been investigated he would ask the magistrate to commit the defendant for trial.

Sidney Wright, hall porter at the Albemarle Club, Piccadilly, said that the defendant presented himself at the club on February 18th and handed him the card produced. The words on it were written in the presence of witness with the exception of the word "a." Defendant said, "Give that to Oscar Wilde." Witness wrote on the card the day and hour when the card was given him, and put it into an envelope so that the card should not be lost. When Mr. Wilde called at the club he handed him the envelope containing the card, saying that Lord Queensberry had left it for him.

Inspector Greet, of the C Division, deposed that he arrested the prisoner at Carter's Hotel* on that

* 14 and 15, Albemarle Street, Piccadilly, W.

(Saturday) morning. The Marquis said, "In these cases I thought proceedings were generally taken by summons, but I suppose it is all right. What is the date?" He told him the 18th of February. The Marquis then said, "I have been wanting to find Mr. Oscar Wilde for nine or ten days. This thing has been going on for about two years." He made no reply when charged at Vine Street Police Station.

• Sir George Lewis :—Let me say one word, sir. I venture to say that when the circumstances of this case are more fully known, that Lord Queensberry, acting as he did under feelings of great indignation, and— .

Mr. Newton (interrupting) :—I cannot go into that now.

Sir George Lewis :—I do not wish this case to be adjourned without it being known that there is nothing against the honour of Lord Queensberry.

The Magistrate : You mean to say that you have a perfect answer to the charge.

On bail being applied for, Mr. Humphrys said he should like a surety, to which Sir George Lewis replied, "Lord Queensberry is not going to run away."

Mr. Newton :—The case will be adjourned for a week, and the defendant will have to find one surety in the sum of £500 and enter into his own recognisances in the sum of £1,000.

Mr. William Tyser, merchant, 13, Gloucester Square, W., offered the necessary bail, and the Marquis of Queensberry left the court with his friends.

ii.—LORD QUEENSBERRY CHARGED—MAGISTERIAL DECISION

Even considering the social and public standing of those concerned in the charge brought by Mr. Oscar Wilde against the Marquis of Queensberry, the interest taken in the case when it came on 'for hearing' for the second time, on Saturday, March 9th, was phenomenal. From the time the court opened, although it was known that night-charges, the speciality of Marlborough Street, would occupy an hour or two, there was a constant stream of persons seeking admission. Many well-known people endeavoured to obtain seats on the bench, but the available space was soon taken up and refusals became general. No one was admitted till 11-30, and then there was a tremendous rush for even standing room, a proceeding in which Press representatives were forced to join with the merely inquisitive spectators. Mr. Carson, Q.C., who represented the Marquis of Queensberry, was the first of the Counsel to put in an appearance. He was quickly followed to the court by Mr. Oscar Wilde, who drove up in a carriage with a pair of horses, accompanied by Lord Alfred Douglas and Lord Douglas of Hawick, sons of the Marquis. So scanty was the accommodation of the court that the prosecutor was unable for some time to obtain a seat, and Mr. Humphreys, the pro-

secuting solicitor, had to apply to the bench for a seat for his clerk.

When the case was called on, the Marquis entered the dock, but Mr. Newton, the magistrate, at once ordered a chair to be placed at the disposal of the accused outside the rails. The examination of Mr. Wilde proceeded slowly, but the answer to almost the first question addressed to the prosecution called forth a mild word from the bench. "Are you a dramatist and author?" asked his solicitor. "I believe I am well known in that capacity," came the reply, which prompted Mr. Newton to say, "Only answer the questions, please." During the examination, the Marquis, in order to be nearer his advisers, was, at the suggestion of the magistrate, permitted to occupy a seat behind Mr. Carson and his solicitor, Mr. C. Russell. The case had not proceeded far when the inevitable legal discussion ensued, and revealed other suggested charges contained in letters written by father to son. The magistrate deprecated importing further alleged libels, which could be reserved for the trial, and on Mr. Newton's advice they were withdrawn, although Mr. Carson, speaking for the defendant, raised no objection to additional charges being advanced. When the witness, who gave his full name as "Oscar Fingall O'Flahertie Wills Wilde," had concluded his evidence, the magistrate asked the legal advisers on both sides to have a few words with him in his private room. After an interval of some minutes they returned into court, but nothing was said as to what had transpired without. However, the proceedings did not get much further, for the

magistrate ruled cross-examination out of order, as it amounted to a *plea* of justification which, he said, could be urged only at the Old Bailey.

The prosecuting solicitor quoted a case to support the ruling, and Mr. Carson, while bowing to the dictum of the bench, expressed surprise that his learned friend should also have taken exception. This closed the case for the prosecution, and the depositions of Mr. Wilde were read over to him. He made one correction, and was about to affix his signature, when he asked to have a certain portion of the evidence read over a second time. "If you would just attend, this would not have happened," said the magistrate testily, but the privilege was accorded, and after a whisper from the usher, "Initials will do," in reply to whether he should "sign in full," Mr. Oscar Wilde, without removing his gloves, took quill in hand and appended his initials to the depositions. Standing behind his Counsel, the Marquis of Queensberry, in answer to the magistrate, said, in reference to the terrible charge he had made, that he would abide by what he had written on the card left at the Albemarle Club.

The defendant was then committed to take his trial, witnesses were bound over in formal terms to appear at the Central Criminal Court, the Marquis was admitted to bail, and Mr. Wilde drove away in his carriage.

THE PROCEEDINGS

On Saturday, March 9th, at Marlborough Street Police Court, before Mr. Newton, the Marquis of

Queensberry, residing at Carter's Hotel, Piccadilly, W., surrendered to his bail to answer the charge of libelling Mr. Oscar Wilde by the utterance and publication of a false and defamatory libel on an inscribed card which Lord Queensberry was alleged to have handed to the hall porter of the Albemarle Club on the 18th of February preceding.

Sir George Lewis had ceased to act for the Marquis of Queensberry, the duties of the defence being undertaken by Mr. E. H. Carson, Q.C., M.P., and Mr. C. F. Gill, instructed by Messrs Day and Russell, of Norfolk Street, Strand. Mr. C. O. Humphreys appeared for Mr. Oscar Wilde.

The court was crowded. The defendant, by order of the magistrate, was given a seat in front of the dock and afterwards with his Counsel. Mr. Oscar Wilde was accompanied by Lord Alfred Douglas, a son of the Marquis of Queensberry, but the magistrate directed Lord Alfred to leave the court at once.

Mr. Oscar Wilde was then called upon, and proceeded to the witness box.

Mr. Humphreys:—Are you a dramatist and author?

Witness:—I believe I am well known in that capacity.

The Magistrate:—Only answer the questions, please.

Mr. Humphreys:—You take a great interest in matters of art?—Yes.

And reside at 16, Tite Street, Chelsea?—Yes.

Are you acquainted with the defendant and with many members of his family?—Yes.

When did you first become acquainted with the defendant?—I think about 1893.

When did you leave Oxford?—In 1878.

You remember you were lunching with Lord Alfred Douglas in the Café Royal—when was that?—My impression is that it was in the month of October, 1892.

Did the defendant come into the room where you were lunching?—Yes.

Did he come to the same table by invitation or no?—Yes, at the invitation of his son.

Did he shake hands with either or both of you on that occasion?—With both of us.

Did he sit down and lunch at the same table?—Yes.

How long afterwards was it before you saw him again?—I did not see him again till the early part of March, 1894.

Was that on an occasion when you and Lord Alfred Douglas were lunching together at the Café Royal?—Yes.

His lordship, I believe, entered the room while you were lunching?—Yes.

Did he come to the same table?—Yes.

Did he receive any invitation to come there?—No; he came up and shook hands with his son, and I invited him to join us.

Was that shortly after Lord Alfred had returned from Egypt?—Just after.

Then there was a general conversation between the three of you?—Yes.

Shortly after that did Lord Alfred Douglas hand you a letter dated the 1st of April? 1

Mr. Newton :—What do you intend to do with that letter?

Mr. Humphreys :—I am asking if he handed the witness a letter.

Mr. Newton :—I think you are adopting a course that you had better not pursue.

Mr. Humphreys :—But I have other libels to put in.

Mr. Newton :—I suggest that you should not examine on the letters.

Mr. Humphreys :—Your suggestions are always very valuable.

Mr. Carson :—I hope the letters will be put in.

Mr. Newton :—I see your point clearly.

Mr. Carson :—My point is that Lord Queensberry was acting in the interest of his son.

Mr. Newton :—You had better not go into that. It would be opening a door to something that ought not to take place in this court. It may be done elsewhere.

Mr. Carson :—Unless the documents are produced they cannot be attached to the depositions.

Mr. Newton (to Mr. Humphreys) :—Surely you would give the defendant notice if you intend to produce other libels at the trial?

Mr. Humphreys :—I will adopt that course.

Mr. Newton :—It would be useless to let you go on.

Mr. Carson :—If my friend intends to proceed under the Vexatious Indictments Act,* he must have a committal upon it. I would go into the question of Lord Queensberry giving advice to his son.

* xxii & xxiii. Vict., c. 17

Mr. Humphreys :—You don't know that the letter contains only advice to his son.

Mr. Carson :—Don't I? I happen to have a copy of it.

Mr. Newton (to Mr. Humphreys) :—All I say is that you are opening a door to let something in which would be very objectionable. At the trial you can say that you have other libels against Mr. Oscar Wilde and mention dates.

Mr. Carson :—I shall object to that course unless the letters are produced. To make a general statement that there were other libels from Lord Queensberry would be begging the question. I ask to have the document put in and the fullest investigation made into the charge.

Mr. Humphreys :—It was not my intention to read the letters in the first instance, as the names of exalted personages are mentioned, and I do not think it right that their names should transpire. I intended to produce the letters and to ask you to read them, as well as my learned friend, and that they should not be read in public. It would not be right that the names mentioned should be called in question in matters of this kind.

Mr. Newton :—Is not that a reason why my suggestion should be adopted?

Mr. Humphreys :—I propose to ask and leave it to your decision whether I should do so this afternoon. (To witness) Have you seen letters to Lord Alfred Douglas written by Lord Queensberry in which your name is mentioned?

Mr. Carson :—I object without production of

documents. Either drop them out altogether or put them in.

Mr. Humphreys:—On Thursday, the 28th of last month, about five o'clock in the afternoon, did you drive up to the Albemarle Club?

Witness:—Yes. It was my first appearance at the club after my return from Algiers.

Mr. Humphreys:—You had some conversation with the hall porter?—Yes, I spoke to him.

Did he hand you the envelope which is produced?—Yes. My name is on it.

In handing it to you did the hall porter say anything?—He gave me a message from Lord Queensberry.

What did the porter say?—“Lord Queensberry desired me, sir, to hand this to you when you came into the club.”

And what did he hand to you?—The envelope with the card inside. It was an open envelope. I found the card produced in it.

On the back of the card there is a date?—Yes: “4-30; 18-2-95.”

Did you read what was on the card?—Yes.*

Did you immediately communicate with your solicitor, and have an interview the following day with him?—Yes. And on that day also I applied, through my solicitor, for a warrant for Lord Queensberry's apprehension.

This concluded the examination in chief.

* The exact words on the card were: “To Oscar Wilde posing as a somdomite” (*sic*). The word “posing” was inserted under legal advice. “Somdomite” was the Marquis's quaint spelling.

Mr. Newton :—I suggest, Mr. Humphreys, that you and Mr. Carson have an interview with me in my private room.

On returning, Mr. Carson said to the witness :— How long have you known Lord Alfred Douglas?

Mr. Newton :—Pardon me, have you any right to cross-examine in this court?

Mr. Carson :—I think so, certainly.

Mr. Newton :—How far will it go?

Mr. Carson :—I should desire to show that the step taken by Lord Queensberry was with a view of putting an end to the acquaintanceship between Mr. Wilde and his son.

Mr. Newton :—That would be quasi-justification, and is not admissible here.

Mr. Humphreys submitted that in the case of *Reg. v. Sir Richard Carden** an application was made on behalf of the defendants for a mandamus to the effect that the magistrate should hear evidence in cross-examination of the complainant or the complainant's witnesses. That case withheld permission. That was before the Court of Appeal, Lord Chief Justice Cockburn and Lords Justice Lush and Manisty, and they unanimously decided to discharge the rule.

Mr. Carson said that went only as far as to lay down that they must not cross-examine on a plea of justification, but it did not overrule the ordinary right to cross-examine. A great deal depended on the decision of the magistrate. It was always for a jury to say whether it was or was not a libel which ought to be criminally punished; therefore he did not put in any

* November 21, 1879. See *Law Reports*, 1880, vol. v., page 1.

plea of justification. That was the plea that Lord Queensberry would raise if the case were sent for trial. He proposed to show why Lord Queensberry sent that letter, and his contention was that Lord Queensberry thought it was well for the morality of his son to put a stop to the relations between the parties. Counsel was quite willing to submit to the decision of the magistrate on the point, though he was surprised that Mr. Humphreys should persist in it.

Mr. Humphreys :—That is the case, your worship.

On the evidence being read over by Mr. Lyell, the clerk, Mr. Wilde said that the words used by the porter were, "Lord Queensberry desires me to hand you this card."

Mr. Wilde :—I should like to see if the date as to when I was first introduced to Lord Queensberry has been correctly named.

Mr. J. R. Lyell, chief clerk, read the deposition giving the date, as Mr. Wilde had stated, 1893.

Mr. Wilde :—I believe now it was 1892.

The deposition was amended accordingly.

Inspector Greet's evidence was next read over, describing the arrest of the Marquis and the words used by him in reply to the warrant when it was read over to him.

This being the case for the prosecution, the magistrate said :—John Douglas, having heard the evidence, now is the time to make an answer to the charge. You need not say anything unless you please; but recollect that whatever you do say will be taken down in writing and may be given in evidence against you at your trial. What have you to say?

Standing behind his Counsel, the Marquis said, "I have simply, your worship, to say this. I wrote that card simply with the intention of bringing matters to a head, having been unable to meet Mr. Wilde otherwise, and to save my son, and I abide by what I wrote."

Mr. Newton :—Then you are committed for trial, and the same bail will be allowed you as before.

NOTE.—Up to the time of Lord Queensberry being committed for trial the only evidence in the possession of Wilde's accusers consisted of some letters which Wilde had written to Lord Alfred Douglas. These letters a man named Allen had stolen and handed to a solicitor named Abrahams, who tried to get Wilde to buy them under the threat that they would be made public. Wilde replied : "I hope they will be published." Subsequently, after a series of events, which it is not possible to relate in full here, the letters passed into the possession of the Marquis of Queensberry, who took legal advice upon them. He was told that on the evidence of the letters alone no charge could be made against Wilde. Between March 9th and March 30th all the evidence given in the subsequent trial at the Old Bailey was collected by the Marquis's friends with the aid of private detectives and blackmailers.

iii.—THE TRIAL OF LORD QUEENSBERRY AT THE OLD BAILEY

Proceedings on the Queen's Commission of Oyer and Terminer and Gaol Delivery for the City of London, and Gaol Delivery for the County of Middlesex and the parts of the Counties of Essex, Kent, and Surrey, within the jurisdiction of the Central Criminal Court, held on Monday, March 25th, 1895, and following days, before the Right Hon. Sir Joseph Renals, Knt., Lord Mayor of the City of London; the Hon. Sir Richard Henn Collins, Knt., one of the Justices of Her Majesty's High Court of Justice; Sir John Whittaker Ellis, Bart., Sir Joseph Savory, Bart., Sir David Evans, K.C.M.G., Sir Stuart Knill, Bart., Aldermen of the said City; Sir Charles Hall, Q.C., M.P., K.C.M.G., Recorder of the said City; Benjamin Faudel Phillips, Esq., Lieut.-Col. Horatio David Davies, Esq., Frank Green, Esq., Sir Joseph Cockfield Dimsdale, Knt., James Thomson Ritchie, Esq., John Pound, Esq., Walter Vaughan Morgan, Esq., William Purdie Treloar, Esq., John Charles Bell, Esq., George Wyatt Truscott, Esq., other of the Aldermen of the said City; Sir Forrest Fulton, Knt., Q.C., Common Sergeant of the said City; and Robert Malcolm Kerr, Esq., Judge of the City of London Court; Her Majesty's Justices of Oyer and Terminer and General

Gaol Delivery, holden for the said City, and Judges of the Central Criminal Court. Marcus Samuel, Esq., Alderman, and George Hand, Esq., being Sheriffs; and Thomas Beard, Esq., and Francis Robert Middleton Phillips, Esq., being Under-Sheriffs.

On Wednesday, April 3rd, 1895, at the Old Bailey, before Mr. Justice Henn Collins, the trial was begun of the Marquis of Queensberry for maliciously publishing a defamatory libel against Mr. Oscar Wilde.

Despite the nature of the evidence to be offered, the court was densely crowded. It was significant, however, that no ladies were present.

The Marquis was the first to arrive. He came in alone, and stood, hat in hand, in front of the dock. He spoke to nobody, and nobody spoke to him. There was little that was aristocratic in the Marquis's appearance. He was short of stature, with a round face, clean shaven except for a streak of red whisker. His lower lip drooped considerably. He wore a Cambridge-blue hunting-stock instead of a collar and a tie. A few minutes before half-past ten, Mr. Oscar Wilde entered the court, and took a seat immediately in front of his Counsel, Sir Edward Clarke and Mr. Charles Mathews, with whom he at once joined in an animated conversation. There was none of that tendency to flippancy that some thought they detected in the prosecutor at the police court. He was intensely grave, and asked that a glass of water might be placed in front of him and passed on to him in the witness-box. The consultation which Mr. Charles Russell had with Inspector Littlechild indicated that

it was the latter who was the private detective who had charge of some of the evidence involved in the plea of justification.

The Judge was ten minutes late, but (the Marquis having entered the dock) the preliminary proceedings were soon got through, and at a quarter to eleven Sir Edward Clarke began his speech for the prosecution. Everybody listened attentively to the story, as set forth by Counsel, of the prosecutor's achievements at college, his subsequent success as a *littérateur*, and the circumstances under which he became acquainted with the defendant's family. But when, Counsel proceeded to refer to certain letters written by Wilde to Lord Alfred Douglas, which had been found in the pocket of a coat belonging to that young gentleman, the Judge took copious notes. These he supplemented later by recording Wilde's version of conversations he had had with three men named Wood, Allen, and Cliburn, who, having secured copies of these letters, were endeavouring to extort money from the writer for their return. Of the nature of the prosecutor's relations with these men something was learned in cross-examination.

Sir Edward Clarke's story of the visit of the defendant to the St. James's Theatre on the first night of "The Importance of Being Earnest" with a bunch of vegetables, and of his failure to obtain admission to the theatre, was greeted with loud laughter, which was repeated when, by a slip of the tongue, Sir Edward Clarke substituted the name of Lord Rosebery for that of the defendant. But this levity was rebuked in indignant tones by the eminent Counsel.

“The Picture of Dorian Gray,” a novel written by Mr. Oscar Wilde, and a contribution of his to a magazine called “The Chameleon,” under the heading of “Phrases and Philosophies for the Use of the Young,” were mentioned in the plea of the defence as “immoral and obscene,” and Sir Edward Clarke occupied some time in an endeavour to prove the contrary. He gave a synopsis of “Dorian Gray,” and declared that there was nothing in it to merit the description applied to it. With regard to “The Chameleon,” Counsel admitted that it contained a story entitled, “The Priest and the Acolyte,” which was loathsome and filthy; but he declared that his client could not be held responsible for the publication as a whole, he being but a contributor to its pages. As a matter of fact, Mr. Wilde had urged upon the editor that the paper should be withdrawn. The opening speech lasted just an hour.

The porter of the Albemarle Club was then put into the witness-box to prove the receipt by him of the card upon which the libellous words were written. Mr. Carson, Q.C. (with whom were Mr. C. F. Gill and Mr. A. Gill), asked no questions of the witness on behalf of the defence, and a few minutes before twelve Mr. Wilde was called into the box. He wore a tight-fitting frockcoat of a dark material, a collar with wide points, and a black tie. His hair was banked on the top of his head and carefully parted down the centre. His manner was confident, and he leaned over the narrow rail, which shuts in the witness, while he toyed with a pair of gloves and stood in readiness to reply to the questions of his

Counsel. The Marquis, turning slightly round in the dock, faced the witness with an expression of supreme contempt, supplemented occasionally, as the evidence proceeded, by subdued and angry mutterings. When the witness narrated the circumstances of his first meeting with Lord Alfred Douglas, the defendant asked for writing materials, and wrote a lengthy note, which was handed down to his Counsel. Wilde was quite at home in the hands of Sir Edward Clarke. He answered in a modulated voice the friendly questions addressed to him, though his affected manner made his replies rather difficult to catch. During the portion of his examination which treated of the interviews he had with the three men regarding the letters sent by him to Lord Alfred Douglas, Wilde asked for and obtained permission to explain in his own way exactly what took place. With eyes fixed on the ceiling, and in a deliberate style, he narrated with remarkable precision the exact words used on the occasion. The examination in chief lasted an hour and five minutes, and went no further than to bear out Sir Edward Clarke's opening speech.

Mr. Carson had the witness under cross-examination for three-quarters of an hour before the adjournment for lunch. The brilliant Irish advocate (who was suffering from a bad cold) spoke in subdued tones, and was obviously conscious of the responsibility of his task. A reference to witness's own age and that of Lord Alfred Douglas led up to questions as to the places at home and abroad where they had stayed together. It became apparent early that the

line of cross-examination adopted by Mr. Carson would result in a conflict between Counsel. Mr. Wilde was being questioned as to his opinion of certain extracts from a story in "The Chameleon," when Sir Edward Clarke jumped to his feet and appealed to the Judge whether the questions were relevant, inasmuch as Wilde was not responsible for the story. The Judge ruled in favour of Mr. Carson. Sir Edward, a few moments later, raised another objection, but he was again overruled. Mr. Carson had considerable difficulty in keeping the witness in hand. When taking him through his axioms for the young, as set forth in "The Chameleon," Wilde persisted in supplementing his answers with speeches explaining what he himself considered to be the true meaning of his own words. These little speeches consisted of metaphysical definitions of the aphorisms which Mr. Carson read out to him, and were full of epigram and paradox.

The interval for luncheon came as a pleasant relief to all. On the application of Mr. Carson, the Judge consented to the defendant being allowed his freedom till the court resumed its sitting.

On the resumption of the trial, Mr. Carson began quoting passages from "Dorian Gray," as originally published in "Lippincott's Magazine," which did not appear in the book as afterwards published. To this Sir Edward Clarke objected, but before the Judge could give his ruling, Mr. Wilde asked leave to confer with his Counsel. As a result, Mr. Wilde declared that it was immaterial to him from which version Mr. Carson quoted, a remark which led to

the withdrawal by Sir Edward Clarke of his objection.

The reading of the extracts continued, Wilde being asked at the end of each one if he did not consider that the language used pointed to the commission of certain offences. Wilde persisted in addressing the court instead of replying to the questions; and on Mr. Carson making an emphatic protest, the witness became somewhat truculent in his demeanour. His constant reiteration that he was an artist, and could judge of men and things only from the point of view of an artist, caused much amusement. He had admitted that in writing "Dorian Gray" he had in his mind a French work entitled, "A Rebours." Mr. Carson wanted to elicit Wilde's views as to the morality of that work; but Sir Edward Clarke succeeded, on an appeal to the Judge, in stopping any further references to it. Questioned as to a letter he wrote to Lord Alfred Douglas, Wilde was dramatically vehement in denying that there was anything improper in it. Nobody but an artist like himself could have written such a letter; and he persisted in declaring that it was unique, poetic, and beautiful—an opinion received with a contemptuous titter in court. He further asserted that everything he wrote was extraordinary. Some letters he wrote to Lord Alfred were, however, "letters of no importance."

At this stage the line of cross-examination assumed a new phase, and Wilde's admission of his friendship with a man named Wood, and the circumstances which preceded the latter's departure for America, created quite a sensation. Revelation succeeded revelation.

His intimacy with a youth named Shelley, and with a boy named Alphonse Conway at Worthing, caused intense amazement, which culminated in a scene of excitement when Mr. Carson produced in court the clothes and walking-stick which Wilde admitted having given to the last-named youth. This concluded the day's proceedings. A full report of the evidence is given below.

THE CASE FOR THE PROSECUTION

At the Sixth Session of the Central Criminal Court, under the Lord Mayoralty of the Right Hon. Sir Joseph Renals, Knt., John Sholto Douglas, eighth Marquis of Queensberry, fifty-one years of age, was indicted in the Old Court at the Old Bailey, before Mr. Justice Henn Collins and a jury, on Wednesday, April 3rd, 1895, for publishing a criminal libel concerning Mr. Oscar Fingall O'Flahertie Wills Wilde. On the bench with Sir Richard Henn Collins were Sir Reginald Hanson, Alderman Davies, Messrs. Faudel Phillips and Vaughan Morgan, and Alderman and Sheriff Samuel.

Sir Edward Clarke, Q.C., M.P., with Mr. Charles Mathews and Mr. Travers Humphreys, appeared for the prosecution; Mr. Carson, Q.C., M.P., with Mr. C. F. Gill and Mr. A. Gill, defended the accused; while Mr. Besley, Q.C., with Mr. Monckton, held watching briefs for Lord Alfred Douglas and Lord Douglas of Hawick.

The clerk read out the indictment to the effect that the Marquis did unlawfully and maliciously write

and publish a false, malicious, and defamatory libel of and concerning one Oscar Fingall O'Flahertie Wills Wilde, at Albemarle Street, on the eighteenth of February, 1895, at the parish of Saint George's. The Marquis said he pleaded not guilty, and that the libel was true, and that it was for the public benefit that it should be published.

Sir Edward Clarke, in opening the case for the prosecution, said that the libel charged against the defendant was published in the form of a visiting card left by Lord Queensberry at a club to which Mr. Oscar Wilde belonged. On that card his lordship wrote: "Oscar Wilde posing as a sodomite." The accusation contained in the words did not suggest the gravest offence—indeed, the words suggested no guilt of the actual offence, but that the person to whom the libel applied appeared to be, or desired to appear to be, a person guilty of or inclined to the commission of the gravest offence. The publication of such a statement in the manner described was likely seriously to affect the reputation of the person against whom it was made. The point for consideration was not alone whether the card was delivered and whether the defendant could not urge the excuse of strong but mistaken feeling. The defendant by his plea had raised a much graver issue. In that plea there was a series of allegations, mentioning the names of several persons, and it was said in regard to all these persons that Mr. Wilde had solicited them to commit the grave offence, and had been guilty with each and all of them of indecent practices. One would gather from the terms of the plea that Mr. Wilde had been

unsuccessfully soliciting these persons to commit the offence with him. He (Sir Edward) could understand how it was that the statements were put in the form in which they found them: for these people who might be called upon to sustain these charges were persons who would necessarily have to admit in cross-examination that they themselves had been guilty of the gravest of offences.

Mr. Wilde was a gentleman, thirty-eight years of age, the son of Sir William Wilde, a very distinguished Irishman, surgeon oculist, who did great public service as Chairman of the Census Committee in Ireland. Mr. Oscar Wilde had a very brilliant University career at Oxford, and in 1884 had the good fortune to marry the daughter of the late Mr. Horace Lloyd, Q.C. From that day until the present he had lived with his wife, who had borne him two sons, at Tite Street, Chelsea. At that residence Mr. Wilde had received his friends, who included Lord Alfred Douglas, defendant's son, and the Marchioness of Queensberry, the late wife of the Marquis, from whom, however, she had been released in the marriage tie on account of the defendant's conduct. These people had been the guests of Mr. Wilde also at his country houses at Wokingham, Salisbury, Goring, and Worthing. In November, 1892, Mr. Wilde and Lord Alfred Douglas were lunching together at the Café Royal, in Regent Street. The Marquis entered, and Mr. Wilde knowing that some unhappy family matters—with which, however, he had nothing to do—had brought about strained feelings between Lord Alfred and his father, suggested to the former

that it was a good opportunity for speaking to his father. He did so. The two shook hands. Lord Alfred introduced his father to Mr. Wilde, and the three lunched together.

Between that time and 1894 Mr. Wilde became aware that certain statements were being made against his character—Counsel did not mean by Lord Queensberry. He became aware of it in this way. There was a man named Alfred Wood, whom Mr. Wilde had seen once or twice, but knew very little indeed about. Wood had been given some clothes by Lord Alfred Douglas, and stated that in the pocket of a coat so given to him he had found four letters which had been written by Mr. Wilde to Lord Alfred. Whether he did find them in the pocket, or whether he stole them, was a matter on which they could only speculate; but at all events, Wood went to Mr. Wilde early in 1893 and wanted Mr. Wilde to give him something for the letters, representing that he was in great distress and trouble and wanted to get off to America. Mr. Wilde gave him £15 or £20 wherewith to pay his passage. Wood then handed over three very ordinary letters which Mr. Wilde had written to Lord Alfred Douglas. But, as generally happened when people thought they had letters of some importance, the letters of no importance were given up, and that which was supposed to be of some importance was retained. That was the case in this instance. Something had been found out about the set of people taking part in these transactions,—men named Wood, Allen, and Cliburn.

In 1893 Mr. Wilde had written a play which after-

wards proved a great success at the Haymarket—"A Woman of No Importance"**—and while this was being prepared for production, there came into the hands of Mr. Beebohm Tree a piece of paper which purported to be, and to some extent was, a copy of a letter which had been retained by the persons named when the other letters had been handed over. On this paper was written: "Kindly give this to Mr. Oscar Wilde, and oblige yours," and then there followed some initials. Shortly afterwards Allen called on Mr. Wilde, and said he had the original letter†. He asked Mr. Wilde to give him something for it. Mr. Wilde absolutely and peremptorily refused, saying: "I have a copy of that letter, and the original is of no use to me. I look upon it as a work of art. I should have desired to possess it, but now that you have been good enough to send me a copy I do not want the original." He sent Allen away, giving him ten shillings for himself. Almost immediately afterwards Cliburn came and said that Allen so much appreciated his (Mr. Wilde's) kindness that he sent back the letter. The man then handed over the letter, and Mr. Wilde gave him half-a-sovereign for his trouble. Having once got the original letter into his possession, Mr. Wilde kept it. He said then, and said now, that he looked upon it as a sort of prose sonnet. He told Allen that it would probably appear in sonnet form; and on

* Produced April 19, 1893.

† On the first night of *A Woman of No Importance* Allen offered the letter to Wilde for £10. "Ten pounds?" said Wilde. "You have no appreciation of literature. If you had asked me for fifty pounds I might have given it to you."

May 4th, 1893, a publication was issued called "The Spirit Lamp, An Aesthetic, Literary and Critical Magazine," edited by Lord Alfred Douglas; and on the first page was a sonnet in French, described as "A letter written in prose poetry by Mr. Oscar Wilde to a friend, and translated into rhymed poetry by a poet of no importance." It was not an exact reproduction, but a paraphrase of the letter.* Here was the letter:—

MY OWN BOY,

Your sonnet is quite lovely, and it is a marvel that those red rose-leaf lips of yours should have been made no less for music of song than for madness of kisses. Your slim gilt soul walks between passion and poetry. I know Hyacinthus, whom Apollo loved so madly, was you in Greek days.

Why are you alone in London, and when do you go to Salisbury? Do go there to cool your hands in the grey twilight of Gothic things, and come here whenever you like. It is a lovely place—it only lacks you; but go to Salisbury first.

Always, with undying love,

You: s,

OSCAR.

* SONNET.

A letter written in prose poetry by Mr. Oscar Wilde to a friend, and translated into rhymed poetry by a poet of no importance.

HYACINTHE ! ô mon cœur ! jeune dieu doux et blond !
 Tes yeux sont la lumière de la mer ! ta bouche,
 Le sang rouge du soir où mon soleil se couche . . .
 Je t'aime, enfant câlin, cher aux bras d'Apollon.

Tu chantais, et ma lyre est moins douce, le long
 Des rameaux suspendus que la brise effarouche,
 A frémir, que ta voix à chanter, quand je touche
 Tes cheveux couronnés d'acanthe et de houblon.

The words of that letter, continued Sir Edward Clarke, might appear extravagant to those who were in the habit of writing commercial correspondence (laughter), or those ordinary letters which the necessities of life forced upon one every day; but Mr. Wilde said it was a prose sonnet, and one of which he was in no way ashamed, and was prepared to produce anywhere as the expression of a poetical feeling, and with no relation whatever to the hateful suggestions put to it in the plea in this case.

In the early part of 1894, Lord Queensberry met Mr. Wilde and Lord Alfred again at lunch at the Café Royal. Shortly after that, Mr. Wilde became aware that the defendant was writing letters that affected his (Mr. Wilde's) character and contained suggestions injurious to him. Though he might reasonably (and would, probably, if his own interests alone were concerned) have brought this to some public notice, he abstained from doing so for reasons which he (Sir Edward) was not entitled to state, but Counsel was

Mais tu pars ! tu me fuis pour les Portes d'hercule ;
 Va ! rafraîchis tes mains dans le clair crépuscule
 Des choses où descend l'âme antique. Et reviens,

Hyacinthe adoré ! hyacinthe ! hyacinthe !
 Car je veux voir toujours dans les bois syriens
 Ton beau corps étendu sur la rose et l'absinthe.

PIERRE LOUYS.

From "*The Spirit Lamp. An Aesthetic, Literary and Critical Magazine, Edited by Lord Alfred Douglas.*" Vol. IV., No. 1, May 4, 1893. Oxford : James Thornton, 33 and 41, High Street. Price One Shilling.

(Pierre Louys is the *nom de guerre* of a very distinguished man of letters. He is a son-in-law of the late José Maria de Hérédia, the French Academician.)

sure that the reasons would be obvious before the case had gone very far. And so the latter part of 1894 passed. At an interview in that year, Mr. Wilde gave instructions, in Lord Queensberry's hearing, that the defendant was not to be admitted into his (Mr. Wilde's) house.

In February, 1895, another play by Mr. Oscar Wilde, "The Importance of Being Earnest," was about to be produced at the St. James's Theatre. In the course of the day (February 14th) information reached the management of the theatre, and other persons, with regard to certain intentions on the part of Lord Queensberry. It was a matter of public dramatic history that at a play written by the late Poet Laureate (Lord Tennyson), "The Promise of May,"* Lord Queensberry made some observations in the public theatre.

Mr. Carson said that he could not see how this was evidence.

The Judge remarked that it might be pertinent as explaining the subsequent actions of Mr. Wilde towards Lord Queensberry.

Sir Edward Clarke, continuing, said that on that occasion Lord Queensberry got up in the theatre and, in his character as Agnostic, objected to the representation then being put upon the stage of an Agnostic in the person of Mr. Hermann Vezin. Of course, a disturbance on the night of the production of the new play would be a very serious matter, and would be especially serious if the observations, as they probably would, had gravely affected the charac-

* First produced in 1882.

ter of Mr. Wilde. Lord Queensberry had paid for a seat in the St. James's Theatre, but his money was returned and the police were warned. Lord Queensberry made his appearance in the course of the evening and brought with him a large bouquet made of vegetables (laughter). Whether Lord Queensberry was at all times responsible for his actions was a matter on which the jury might have doubts before the case ended. Instead of writing to the committee of one of the clubs of which Mr. Wilde was a member, and asking for an inquiry, he got a bunch of vegetables and came down to the theatre on the first night of Mr. Wilde's new play. Being refused admission at the box office, he made his way to the gallery stairs; but here, too, the police had received notice, and, being unable to get admission, Lord Queensberry went away.

On the 28th of February Mr. Wilde went to the Albemarle Club, and there received from the porter the card left by Lord Queensberry on the 18th of that month. Hitherto, the accusations had been made in letters to members of Lord Queensberry's family, and thus Mr. Wilde could, if he had chosen, have taken action; but he did not wish to—and would not now further than could be avoided—bring into prominence the relations of Lord Queensberry with the members of his family. On March 1st a warrant was applied for, and on the following day Lord Queensberry was arrested.

There were two counts at the end of the plea, continued Sir Edward, which were extremely curious. It was said that in the month of July, 1890, Mr.

Wilde published, or caused to be published, with his name on the title-page, a certain immoral and indecent work with the title of "The Picture of Dorian Gray," which book was intended to be understood by the readers to describe the relations, intimacies, and passions of certain persons guilty of unnatural practices. And, secondly, that in December, 1894, was published a certain immoral work in the form of "The Chameleon," relating to the practices of persons of unnatural habits; and that Mr. Wilde had joined in procuring the publication of "The Chameleon," with his name on it, as the principal contributor, under the title of "Phrases and Philosophies for the Use of the Young." Those were two very gross allegations, asserted Counsel. "The Chameleon" was numbered Vol. I., Number 1; was published by Messrs. Gay and Bird, of 5, Chandos Street; and only one hundred copies were to be printed. Mr. Wilde did contribute "Phrases and Philosophies for the Use of the Young," and on the first three pages there was a certain number of epigrammatical statements such as those which many of them had enjoyed when being entertained by such a play as "A Woman of No Importance." They gave brilliancy and effect to dialogue, and supplied even wisdom in a witty form. Mr. Wilde was not responsible for the rest of the magazine. It was edited by an Oxford man, who asked Mr. Wilde to contribute. Directly Mr. Wilde saw the magazine, he noticed there was a story in it called "The Priest and the Acolyte," which was a disgrace to literature, which it was amazing anybody wrote, and still more

amazing that anybody allowed to be published under his name.* Directly Mr. Wilde saw that story he communicated with the editor, and upon his insistence the magazine was withdrawn. It was strange indeed, then, to find that publication put upon the particulars as justifying the charge against Mr. Wilde.

The volume called "The Picture of Dorian Gray" was one which could be bought at any bookstall in London. It had Mr. Wilde's name on the title-page, and had been published five years. The story of the book was that of a young man of good birth, great wealth, and great personal beauty, whose friend paints a picture of him. Dorian Gray expresses the wish that he could remain as in the picture, while the picture aged with the years. His wish was granted, and he soon knew that upon the picture, and not upon his own face, the scars of trouble and bad conduct were falling. In the end he stabs the picture and falls dead. The picture is restored to its pristine beauty, while his friends find on the floor the body of a hideous old man.

"I shall be surprised," said Counsel, in conclusion, "if my learned friend can pitch upon any passage in that book which does more than describe as novelists and dramatists may—nay, must—describe the passions and the fashions of life.

"Witnesses will be called who will prove the publication of the libel, and my learned friend has the task of satisfying you that the excuses made are true."

* Sir Edward Clarke was in error. The story was published anonymously and signed "X" only, though the author's real name was more or less an open secret in Oxford at the time.

Sidney Wright, hall porter at the Albemarle Club, was called. He proved that Lord Queensberry left with him the card containing the alleged libel. Witness stated that he put the card into an envelope and handed it to Mr. Wilde on February 28th. Witness looked at the card but did not understand it.

Mr. Oscar Wilde, who was next put into the box and examined by Sir Edward Clarke, said:—I am the prosecutor in this case. I am thirty-nine years of age. My father was Sir William Wilde, surgeon, of Dublin, and Chairman of the Census Commission. He died when I was at Oxford (1876). I was a student at Trinity College, where I took a classical scholarship and the gold medal for Greek. I then went to Magdalen College, Oxford, where I took a classical scholarship, a first in “ Mods.,” and a first in “ Greats,” and the Newdigate Prize for English verse. I took my degree in 1878, and came down at once. From that time I have devoted myself to art and literature. In 1881 I published a volume of poems, and afterwards lectured in England and America. In 1884 I married Miss Lloyd, and from that date till now have lived with her in Tite Street, Chelsea. I have two sons, the elder of whom will be ten in June and the second nine in November.

Sir Edward Clarke:—In 1891 did you make the acquaintance of Lord Alfred Douglas?

Witness:—Yes: he was brought to my house by a friend. Before then I had not been acquainted with Lady Queensberry, but since then I have been a guest in her house many times. I also knew Lord Douglas of Hawick and the late Lord Drumlanrig.

Lord Alfred has dined with me from time to time at my house, and at the Albemarle Club, of which my wife is a member, and has stayed with us at Cromer, Goring, Worthing, and Torquay. In November, 1892, I was lunching with him at the Café Royal, where we met Lord Queensberry, and on my suggestion Lord Alfred went up to him and shook hands. I was aware that there had been some estrangement between the two. Lord Queensberry joined us. Lord Alfred had to go away early, and Lord Queensberry remained and chatted with me. Afterwards something was said about Torquay, and it was arranged that Lord Queensberry should call upon me there, but he did not come. From November 3rd, 1892, till March, 1894, I did not see the defendant, but in 1893 I heard that some letters which I had addressed to Lord Alfred Douglas had come into the hands of certain persons.

Did any one say that he had found letters of yours? —Yes. A man named Wood saw me at the rooms of Mr. Alfred Taylor and told me that he had found some letters in a suit of clothes which Lord Alfred Douglas had been good enough to give him.

Did he ask for anything? —I don't think he made a direct demand.

What happened? —When he entered the room, he said, "I suppose you will think very badly of me." I replied, "I hear that you have letters of mine to Lord Alfred Douglas which you certainly ought to have given back." He handed me three or four letters, and said they had been stolen from him "the day before yesterday" by a man named Allen, and

that he (Wood) had had to employ a detective to get them back. I read the letters, and said that I did not think them of any importance. He said, "I am very much afraid of staying in London, as this man and other men are threatening me. I want money to go away to America." I asked what better opening as a clerk he could have in America than in England, and he replied that he was anxious to get out of London in order to escape from the man who had taken the letters from him. He made a very strong appeal to me. He said that he could find nothing to do in London. I paid him £15. The letters remained in my hand all the time.

Did some man shortly afterwards come with another letter?—A man called and told me that the letter, a copy of which had been sent to Mr. Beerbohm Tree, was not in his possession. His name was Allen.

What happened at that interview?—I felt that this was the man who wanted money from me. I said, "I suppose you have come about my beautiful letter to Lord Alfred Douglas. If you had not been so foolish as to send a copy of it to Mr. Beerbohm Tree, I would gladly have paid you a very large sum of money for the letter, as I consider it to be a work of art." He said, "A very curious construction can be put on that letter." I said in reply, "Art is rarely intelligible to the criminal classes." He said, "A man has offered me £60 for it." I said to him, "If you take my advice you will go to that man and sell my letter to him for £60. I myself have never received so large a sum for any prose work of that length; but I am glad to find that there is some on-

in England who considers a letter of mine worth £60." He was somewhat taken aback by my manner, perhaps, and said, "The man is out of town." I replied, "He is sure to come back," and I advised him to get the £60. He then changed his manner a little, saying that he had not a single penny, and that he had been on many occasions trying to find me. I said that I could not guarantee his cab expenses, but that I would gladly give him half-a-sovereign. He took the money and went away.

Was anything said about a sonnet?—Yes. I said, "The letter, which is a prose poem, will shortly be published in sonnet form in a delightful magazine, and I will send you a copy of it."

As a matter of fact, the letter was the basis of a French poem that was published in "The Spirit Lamp"?—Yes.

It is signed "Pierre Louÿs." Is that the *nom de plume* of a friend of yours?—Yes, a young French poet of great distinction, a friend of mine, who has lived in England.

Did Allen then go away?—Yes, and in about five minutes Cliburn came to the house. I went out to him and said, "I cannot bother any more about this matter." He produced the letter out of his pocket, saying, "Allen has asked me to give it back to you." I did not take it immediately, but asked: "Why does Allen give me back this letter?" He said, "Well, he says that you were kind to him, and that there is no use trying to 'rent' you as you only laugh at us." I took the letter and said, "I will accept it back, and you can thank Allen from me for

all the anxiety he has shown about it." I looked at the letter, and saw that it was extremely soiled. I said to him, "I think it is quite unpardonable that better care was not taken of this original manuscript of mine" (laughter). He said he was very sorry, but it had been in so many hands. I gave him half-a-sovereign for his trouble, and then said, "I am afraid you are leading a wonderfully wicked life." He said, "There is good and bad in every one of us." I told him he was a born philosopher, and he then left.

Has the letter remained in your possession ever since?—Yes. I produce it here to-day.

I pass to the end of 1893. Did Lord Alfred Douglas go to Cairo then?—Yes; in December, 1893.

On his return were you lunching together in the Café Royal when Lord Queensberry came in?—Yes. He shook hands and joined us, and we chatted on perfectly friendly terms about Egypt and various other subjects.

Shortly after that meeting did you become aware that he was making suggestions with regard to your character and behaviour?—Yes. Those suggestions were not contained in letters to me. At the end of June, 1894, there was an interview between Lord Queensberry and myself in my house. He called upon me, not by appointment, about four o'clock in the afternoon, accompanied by a gentleman with whom I was not acquainted. The interview took place in my library. Lord Queensberry was standing by the window. I walked over to the fireplace, and he said to me, "Sit down." I said to him, "I do not allow any one to talk like that to me in my house or

anywhere else. I suppose you have come to apologise for the statement you made about my wife and myself in letters you wrote to your son. I should have the right any day I chose to prosecute you for writing such a letter." He said, "The letter was privileged, as it was written to my son." I said, "How dare you say such things to me about your son and me?" He said, "You were both kicked out of the Savoy Hotel at a moment's notice for your disgusting conduct." I said, "That is a lie." He said, "You have taken furnished rooms for him in Piccadilly." I said, "Somebody has been telling you an absurd set of lies about your son and me. I have not done anything of the kind." He said, "I hear you were thoroughly well blackmailed for a disgusting letter you wrote to my son." I said, "The letter was a beautiful letter, and I never write except for publication." Then I asked: "Lord Queensberry, do you seriously accuse your son and me of improper conduct?" He said, "I do not say that you are it, but you look it" (laughter).

His Lordship:—I shall have the court cleared if I hear the slightest disturbance again.

Witness (continuing Lord Queensberry's remarks):—"But you look it, and you pose as it, which is just as bad. If I catch you and my son together again in any public restaurant I will thrash you." I said, "I do not know what Queensberry rules are, but the Oscar Wilde rule is to shoot at sight." I then told Lord Queensberry to leave my house. He said he would not do so. I told him that I would have him put out by the police. He said, "It is a

disgusting scandal." I said, " If it be so, you are the author of the scandal, and no one else." I then went into the hall and pointed him out to my servant. I said, " This is the Marquis of Queensberry, the most infamous brute in London. You are never to allow him to enter my house again." It is not true that I was expelled from the Savoy Hotel at any time. Neither is it true that I took rooms in Piccadilly for Lord Queensberry's son. I was at the theatre on the opening night of the play, " The Importance of Being Earnest," and was called before the curtain. The play was successful. Lord Queensberry did not obtain admission to the theatre. I was acquainted with the fact that Lord Queensberry had brought a bunch of vegetables with him.*

When was it you heard the first statement affecting your character?—I had seen communications from Lord Queensberry, not to his son, but to a third party—members of his own and of his wife's families. I went to the Albemarle Club on the 28th of February and received from the porter the card which has been produced. A warrant was issued on the 1st of March.

It is suggested that you are responsible for the publication of the magazine, " The Chameleon," on the front page of which some aphorisms of yours appear. Beyond sending that contribution, had you anything to do with the preparation or publication of that magazine?—No; nothing whatever.

Until you saw this number of " The Chameleon,"

* Wilde wrote to a friend that day: " Bosie's father is going to make a scene to-night. I am going to stop him."

did you know anything about the story "The Priest and the Acolyte"?—Nothing at all.

Upon seeing that story in print, did you communicate with the editor?—The editor came to see me at the Café Royal to speak to me about it.

Did you approve of the story of "The Priest and the Acolyte"?—I thought it bad and indecent, and I strongly disapproved of it.

Was that disapproval expressed to the editor?—Yes.

The other question relates to the book "Dorian Gray." Was that first published in serial form?—It was first published in "Lippincott's," and afterwards in book form with some additional chapters. It was much reviewed.

"Your attention has been called to the plea and to the names of persons with whom your conduct is impugned. Is there any truth in these allegations?—There is no truth whatever in any one of them.

This concluded the prosecutor's examination in chief.

Mr. Carson then rose to cross-examine. He said:—You stated that your age was thirty-nine. I think you are over forty. You were born on October 16th, 1854?—I had no wish to pose as being young. I am thirty-nine or forty. You have my certificate, and that settles the matter.

But being born in 1854 makes you more than forty?—Ah! Very well.

In reply to further questions, prosecutor said:—Lord Alfred Douglas is about twenty-four, and was

between twenty and twenty-one years of age when I first knew him. Down to the time of the interview in Tite Street, Lord Queensberry had been friendly. I did not receive a letter on April 3rd in which Lord Queensberry desired that my acquaintance with his son should cease. After the interview I had no doubt that such was Lord Queensberry's desire. Notwithstanding Lord Queensberry's protest, my intimacy with Lord Alfred Douglas has continued down to the present moment.

You have stayed with him at many places?—Yes.

At Oxford? Brighton—on several occasions? Worthing?—Yes.

You never took rooms for him?—No.

Were you at other places with him?—Yes: at Cromer and at Torquay.

And in various hotels in London?—Yes; at one in Albemarle Street, and in Dover Street, and at the Savoy.

Did you ever take rooms yourself in addition to your house in Tite Street?—Yes; at 10 and 11, St. James's Place. I kept the rooms from the month of October, 1893, to the end of March, 1894. Lord Alfred Douglas has stayed in those chambers, which are not far from Piccadilly. I have been abroad with him several times, and even lately* to Monte Carlo. With reference to these books, it was not at Brighton, in 20, King's Road, that I wrote my article for "The Chameleon." I observed that there were also contributions from Lord Alfred Douglas, but these were not written at Brighton. I had seen them. I

* March 13, 1895.

thought them exceedingly beautiful poems.* One was "In Praise of Shame," and the other, "Two Loves."

They were two boys?—Yes.

One boy calls his "true love," and the other boy calls his love "shame"?—Yes.

Did you think that made any improper suggestion?—No, none whatever.

You read "The Priest and the Acolyte"?—Yes.

You have no doubt whatever that that was an improper story?—From the literary point of view it was highly improper. It is impossible for a man of literature to judge it otherwise; by literature, meaning treatment, selection of subject, and the like. I thought the treatment rotten and the subject rotten.

You are of opinion, I believe, that there is no such thing as an immoral book?—Yes.

May I take it that you think "The Priest and the Acolyte" was not immoral?—It was worse—it was badly written.

Was not the story that of a priest who fell in love with a boy who served him at the altar, and was discovered by the rector in the priest's room, and a scandal arose?—I have read it only once, in last November, and nothing will induce me to read it again. I don't care for it. It doesn't interest me.

Do you think the story blasphemous?—I think it violated every artistic canon of beauty.

That is not an answer.—It is the only one I can give.

* These two poems, after appearing in *The Chameleon*, in December, 1894, were reprinted in Lord Alfred Douglas's *Poems*, published by the *Mercure de France*, Paris, 1896.

I want to see the position you pose in.—I do not think you should say that.

I have said nothing out of the way. I wish to know whether you thought the story blasphemous.—The story filled me with disgust. The end was wrong.

Answer the question, sir. Did you or did you not consider the story blasphemous?—I did not consider the story blasphemous. I thought it disgusting.

I am satisfied with that. You know that when the priest in the story administers poison to the boy, he uses the words of the sacrament of the Church of England?—That I entirely forgot.

Do you consider that blasphemous?—I think it is horrible. “Blasphemous” is not a word of mine.

Mr. Carson then read the following extract from “The Priest and the Acolyte”:

Just before the consecration the priest took a tiny phial from the pocket of his cassock, blessed it, and poured the contents into the chalice.

When the time came for him to receive from the chalice, he raised it to his lips, but did not taste of it.

He administered the sacred wafer to the child, and then he took the beautiful gold chalice, set with precious stones, in his hand; he turned towards him; but when he saw the light in the beautiful face he turned again to the crucifix with a low moan. For one instant his courage failed him; then he turned to the little fellow again, and held the chalice to his lips:

“*The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.*”

Mr. Carson:—Do you approve of those words?

Witness:—I think them disgusting, perfect twaddle.

Mr. Carson :—I think you will admit that any one who would approve of such an article would pose as guilty of improper practices. I do not think so in the person of another contributor to the magazine. It would show very bad literary taste. I strongly objected to the whole story. I took no steps to express disapproval of “The Chameleon” because I think it would have been beneath my dignity as a man of letters to associate myself with an Oxford undergraduate’s productions. I am aware that the magazine may have been circulated among the undergraduates of Oxford. I do not believe that any book or work of art ever had any effect whatever on morality.

Am I right in saying that you do not consider the effect in creating morality or immorality?—Certainly, I do not.

So far as your works are concerned, you pose as not being concerned about morality or immorality?—I do not know whether you use the word “pose” in any particular sense.

It is a favourite word of your own.—Is it? I have no pose in this matter. In writing a play or a book, I am concerned entirely with literature—that is, with art. I aim not at doing good or evil, but in trying to make a thing that will have some quality of beauty.

Listen, sir. Here is one of the “Phrases and Philosophies for the Use of the Young” which you contributed :—“Wickedness is a myth invented by good people to account for the curious attractiveness of others.” You think that true?—I rarely think that anything I write is true.

Did you say “rarely”?—I said “rarely.” I

might have said "never"—not true in the actual sense of the word.

"Religions die when they are proved to be true." Is that true?—Yes; I hold that. It is a suggestion towards a philosophy of the absorption of religions by science, but it is too big a question to go into now.

Do you think that was a safe axiom to put forward for the philosophy of the young?—Most stimulating. "If one tells the truth, one is sure, sooner or later, to be found out"?—That is a pleasing paradox, but I do not set very high store on it as an axiom.

Is it good for the young?—Anything is good that stimulates thought in whatever age.

Whether moral or immoral?—There is no such thing as morality or immorality in thought. There is immoral emotion.

"Pleasure is the only thing one should live for"?—I think that the realisation of oneself is the prime aim of life, and to realise oneself through pleasure is finer than to do so through pain. I am, on that point, entirely on the side of the ancients—the Greeks. It is a pagan idea.

"A truth ceases to be true when more than one person believes in it"?—Perfectly. That would be my metaphysical definition of truth: something so personal that the same truth could never be appreciated by two minds.

"The condition of perfection is idleness: the aim of perfection is youth"?—Oh, yes; I think so. Half of it is true. The life of contemplation is the highest life, and so recognised by the philosopher.

"There is something tragic about the enormous

number of young men there are in England at the present moment who start life with perfect profiles, and end by adopting some useful profession"?—I should think that the young have enough sense of humour.

You think that is humorous?—I think it is an amusing paradox, an amusing play on words.

What would anybody say would be the effect of "Phrases and Philosophies" taken in connection with such an article as "The Priest and the Acolyte"?—Undoubtedly it was the idea that might be formed that made me object so strongly to the story. I saw at once that maxims that were perfectly nonsensical, paradoxical, or anything you like, might be read in conjunction with it.

After the criticisms that were passed on "Dorian Gray," was it modified a good deal?—No. Additions were made. In one case it was pointed out to me—not in a newspaper or anything of that sort, but by the only critic of the century whose opinion I set high, Mr. Walter Pater—that a certain passage was liable to misconstruction, and I made one addition.

This is in your introduction to "Dorian Gray":— "There is no such thing as a moral or an immoral book. Books are well written, or badly written." That expresses your view?—My view on art, yes.

Then, I take it, that no matter how immoral a book may be, if it is well written, it is, in your opinion, a good book?—Yes, if it were well written so as to produce a sense of beauty, which is the highest sense of which a human being can be capable. If it were badly written, it would produce a sense of disgust.

Then a well-written book putting forward perverted moral views may be a good book?—No work of art ever puts forward views. Views belong to people who are not artists.

A perverted novel might be a good book?—I don't know what you mean by a "perverted" novel.

Then I will suggest "Dorian Gray" as open to the interpretation of being such a novel.—That could only be to brutes and illiterates. The views of Philistines on art are incalculably stupid.

An illiterate person reading "Dorian Gray" might consider it such a novel?—The views of illiterates on art are unaccountable. I am concerned only with my view of art. I don't care twopence what other people think of it.

The majority of persons would come under your definition of Philistines and illiterates?—I have found wonderful exceptions.

Do you think that the majority of people live up to the position you are giving us?—I am afraid they are not cultivated enough.

Not cultivated enough to draw the distinction between a good book and a bad book? Certainly not.

The affection and love of the artist of "Dorian Gray" might lead an ordinary individual to believe that it might have a certain tendency?—I have no knowledge of the views of ordinary individuals.

You did not prevent the ordinary individual from buying your book?—I have never discouraged him.

Mr. Carson then read an extract, extending to several pages, from "Dorian Gray," using the version as it appeared in "Lippincott's Magazine" for July,

1890 (pages 6—10), of the meeting between Dorian Gray and the painter, Basil Hallward. On its conclusion, Counsel turned to the witness, and said:—

Now I ask you, Mr. Wilde, do you consider that that description of the feeling of one man towards a youth just grown up was a proper or an improper feeling?—I think it is the most perfect description of what an artist would feel on meeting a beautiful personality that was in some way necessary to his art and life.

You think that is a feeling a young man should have towards another?—Yes, as an artist.

Mr. Carson proceeded to read another long extract. Mr. Wilde asked for a copy, and was given one of the complete edition. Mr. Carson, in calling his attention to the place, remarked: “I believe it was left out in the purged edition.”*

Witness:—I do not call it “purged.”

Counsel:—Yes, I know that; but we will see.

Counsel then read a lengthy passage from “Dorian Gray” as originally published (pages 57, 58), and said:—Do you mean to say that that passage describes the natural feeling of one man towards another?

Witness:—It would be the influence produced on an artist by a beautiful personality.

A beautiful person?—I said a “beautiful personality.” You can describe it as you like. Dorian Gray’s was a most remarkable personality.

May I take it that you, as an artist, have never

* For a list of the chief passages in the original version of *Dorian Gray* which were omitted or altered in the 1891 edition, see *Art and Morality*, edited by Stuart Mason.

known the feeling described here?—I have never allowed any personality to dominate my art.

Then you have never known the feeling you describe?—No. It is a work of fiction.

So far as you are concerned you have no experience as to its being a natural feeling?—I think it is perfectly natural for any artist to admire intensely and love a young man. It is an incident in the life of almost every artist.

But let us go over it phrase by phrase. “I quite admit that I adored you madly.” What do you say to that? Have you ever adored a young man madly?—No, not madly; I prefer love—that is a higher form.

Never mind about that. Let us keep down to the level we are at now.—I have never given adoration to anybody except myself.

I suppose you think that a very smart thing?—Not at all.

Then you have never had that feeling?—No. The whole idea was borrowed from Shakespeare, I regret to say—yes, from Shakespeare’s sonnets.

“I have adored you extravagantly”?—Do you mean financially?

Oh, yes, financially. Do you think we are talking about finance?—I don’t know what you are talking about.

Don’t you? Well, I hope I shall make myself very plain before I have done. “I was jealous of every one to whom you spoke.” Have you ever been jealous of a young man?—Never in my life.

“I wanted to have you all to myself.” Did you

ever have that feeling?—No; I should consider it an intense nuisance, an intense bore.

“I grew afraid that the world would know of my idolatry.” Why should he grow afraid that the world should know of it?—Because there are people in the world who cannot understand the intense devotion, affection, and admiration that an artist can feel for a wonderful and beautiful personality. These are the conditions under which we live. I regret them.

These unfortunate people, that have not the high understanding that you have, might put it down to something wrong?—Undoubtedly; to any point they chose. I am not concerned with the ignorance of others.

In another passage Dorian Gray receives a book. Was the book to which you refer a moral book?—Not well written, but it gave me an idea.

Pressed further upon this point, and as to whether the book he had in mind was not of a certain tendency, Mr. Wilde declined, with some warmth, to be cross-examined upon the work of another artist. It was, he said, “an impertinence and a vulgarity.” He admitted that he had in his mind a French book entitled “A Rebours.” Mr. Carson wanted to elicit the witness’s view as to the morality of that book, but Sir Edward Clarke succeeded, on an appeal to the Judge, in stopping any further reference to it.

Counsel then quoted another extract from the “Lippincott” version of “Dorian Gray” (page 79), in which the artist tells Dorian of the scandals about him, and finally asks: “Why is your friendship so fatal to young men?” Asked whether the passage

in its ordinary meaning did not suggest a certain charge, witness stated that it described Dorian Gray as a man of very corrupt influence, though there was no statement as to the nature of his influence.* "But as a matter of fact," he added, "I do not think that one person influences another, nor do I think there is any bad influence in the world."

Counsel:—A man never corrupts a youth?—I think not.

Nothing could corrupt him?—If you are talking of separate ages.

No, sir, I am talking common sense.—I do not think one person influences another.

You don't think that flattering a young man, making love to him, in fact, would be likely to corrupt him?—No.

Where was Lord Alfred Douglas staying when you wrote that letter to him?—At the Savoy; and I was at Babbacombe, near Torquay.

It was a letter in answer to something he had sent you?—Yes, a poem.

Why should a man of your age address a boy nearly twenty years younger as "My own boy"?—I was fond of him. I have always been fond of him.

Do you adore him?—No, but I have always liked him. I think it is a beautiful letter. It is a poem. I was not writing an ordinary letter. You might as well cross-examine me as to whether "King Lear" or a sonnet of Shakespeare was proper.

* "What Dorian Gray's sins are no one knows. He who finds them has brought them."—Oscar Wilde, in the *Scots Observer*, July 12, 1890.

Apart from art, Mr. Wilde?—I cannot answer apart from art.

Suppose a man who was not an artist had written this letter, would you say it was a proper letter?—A man who was not an artist could not have written that letter.

Why?—Because nobody but an artist could write it. He certainly could not write the language unless he were a man of letters.

I can suggest, for the sake of your reputation, that there is nothing very wonderful in this “ red rose-leaf lips of yours ”?—A great deal depends on the way it is read.

“ Your slim gilt soul walks between passion and poetry.” Is that a beautiful phrase?—Not as you read it, Mr. Carson. You read it very badly.

I do not profess to be an artist; and when I hear you give evidence, I am glad I am not.

Sir Edward Clarke:—I don’t think my friend should talk like that. (To witness) Pray, do not criticise my friend’s reading again.

Mr. Carson referred to various passages in the letter, and asked, “ Is that not an exceptional letter? ”

Witness:—It is unique, I should say.

Was that the ordinary way in which you carried on your correspondence?—No; but I have often written to Lord Alfred Douglas, though I never wrote to another young man in the same way.

Have you often written letters in the same style as this?—I don’t repeat myself in style.

Here is another letter which I believe you also wrote to Lord Alfred Douglas. Will you read

it?—No; I decline. I don't see why I should.
Mr. Carson:—Then I will.

Savoy Hotel,

DEAREST OF ALL BOYS, Victoria Embankment, London.

Your letter was delightful, red and yellow wine to me; but I am sad and out of sorts. Bosie, you must not make scenes with me. They kill me, they wreck the loveliness of life. I cannot see you, so Greek and gracious, distorted with passion. I cannot listen to your curved lips saying hideous things to me. I would sooner—here a word is indecipherable, but I will ask the witness*—than have you bitter, unjust, hating. . . . I must see you soon. You are the divine thing I want, the thing of grace and beauty; but I don't know how to do it. Shall I come to Salisbury? My bill here is £49 for a week. I have also got a new sitting-room. . . . Why are you not here, my dear, my wonderful boy? I fear I must leave—no money, no credit, and a heart of lead.

Your own OSCAR.

Is that an ordinary letter?

Witness:—Everything I write is extraordinary. I do not pose as being ordinary, great heavens! Ask me any question you like about it.

Is it the kind of letter a man writes to another?—It was a tender expression of my great admiration for Lord Alfred Douglas. It was not, like the other, a prose poem.

Were you living at the Savoy?—Yes, I was there for about a month, and had also my house in Tite Street. Lord Alfred had been staying with me at the Savoy immediately before I wrote that letter.

How long had you known Wood?—I think I met him at the end of January, 1893. I met him at the

* The words which Mr. Carson could not read were: "I would sooner be rented than, etc." *Rent* is a slang term for blackmail.

Café Royal where he was sent to find me by Lord Alfred Douglas who telegraphed from Salisbury. Lord Alfred asked me to do what I could for Wood who was seeking a post as a clerk. I do not know where he was living at that time. Taylor was living at 13, Little College Street, and I have been there to tea parties on many occasions. They were all men at the parties, but not all young men. I took Wood to supper at the Florence Restaurant in Rupert Street, because Lord Alfred had asked me to be kind to him.

Who was Wood?—So far as I could make out he had no occupation, but was looking for a situation. He told me he had had a clerkship. At that time he was about twenty-three years of age.

Then, do I understand that the first time you met Wood you took him to supper?—Yes, because I had been asked to be kind to him. Otherwise it was rather a bore.

Was Taylor or anybody else there?—No.

In reply to further questions from Counsel, the witness absolutely denied that he had been guilty of improper conduct with Wood.

Had you a private room at the Florence?—Yes. I went there so that I could get a cheque cashed because the next day was Sunday.

How much did you give Wood then?—£2.

Why?—Because Lord Alfred Douglas asked me to be kind to him. I don't care about different social positions.

I suggest that you first had immoral relations with him and then gave him money?—It is perfectly untrue.

Did you consider that he had come to levy blackmail?—I did; and I determined to face it.

And the way you faced it was by giving him £15 to go to America?—That is an inaccurate description. I saw that the letters were of no value, and I gave him the money after he had told me the pitiful tale about himself, foolishly perhaps, but out of pure kindness.

I suggest that you gave him £30. Did you give him £5 more next day?—Yes; he told me that after paying his passage to America he would be left almost penniless. I gave him £5.

Had you a farewell lunch at the Florence?—Yes.

A farewell lunch with the man who had tried to blackmail you?—He had convinced me that such was not his intention.

The lunch was in a private room?—Yes.

It was after lunch that you gave him £5?—Yes.

After Wood went to America did he ask you for money?—No.

Did he call Taylor by his Christian name?—Yes.

Did Wood call you “Oscar”?—Yes.

What did you call Wood?—His name is Alfred.

Didn’t you call him “Alf”?—No, I never use abbreviations.

Did you not think it a curious thing that a man with whom you were on such intimate terms should try to blackmail you?—I thought it infamous, but Wood convinced me that such had not been his intention, though it was the intention of other people. Wood assured me that he had recovered all the letters.

And then Allen came with a letter, possession of

which you knew he had secured improperly?—
Yes.

What was Allen?—I am told he was a blackmailer.

Was he a blackmailer?—I never heard of him except as a blackmailer.*

Then you began to explain to the blackmailer what a loss your beautiful manuscript was?—I described it as a beautiful work of art.

May I ask why you gave this man, who you knew

* In January, 1898, Cliburn was arrested. On March 11th following, in the name of Robert Cliburn, *alias* Harris, Collins, Stephenson, Robertson, and Carew, he was sentenced to seven years' penal servitude for blackmailing. He had formerly been a telegraph boy in the Post Office. Allen was convicted in May, 1897, for a similar crime, and was sentenced subsequently after giving information which led to the arrest of Cliburn. At the time of the Queensberry prosecution, Allen and Cliburn were hiding together at Broadstairs, where they were found by Messrs. Russell's agents, who were acting on behalf of Lord Queensberry.

William Allen, *alias* Pea, aged twenty-nine, a married man, was arrested at Daventry, April 3, 1897. On May 5 he was indicted before the Common Serjeant, at the Central Criminal Court, for feloniously receiving from a Mr. D—— the sum of £5 on account of helping him to recover certain goods which had been stolen. After the opening statement by Mr. Charles Mathews, the prisoner withdrew his plea, and said he was guilty. The jury delivered their verdict, and judgment was respite. While in prison he gave information which led to the arrest of Cliburn. Allen was sentenced in September to eighteen months' hard labour, to date from May 3 preceding. Allen, in giving evidence against his former friend, Cliburn, at the trial of the latter in March, 1898, said: "We all got money by blackmailing. All those I have spoken of got money in that way. I never knew them do anything else. These men belong to one section of blackmailers. I knew Mr. D——. He gave me £10; I first asked him for £20." It was stated in court that Cliburn had been receiving through a solicitor an annuity of £100 from a gentleman he had been blackmailing for several years. A previous conviction at Lewes in December, 1890, in the name of Robert Henry Harris, was proved against Cliburn.

The prosecution of Cliburn and Allen was conducted by Mr. Charles Mathews on behalf of the Public Prosecutor.

was a notorious blackmailer, ten shillings?—I gave it out of contempt.

Then the way you show your contempt is by paying ten shillings?—Yes, very often.

I suppose he was pleased with your contempt?—Yes, he was apparently pleased at my kindness.

A few minutes afterwards did Cliburn come to the door?—Yes. Allen had mentioned my kindness to him.

Did you know Cliburn before?—I saw him at the stage door of the Haymarket on April 21st, when he said that he wanted to speak to me about a letter which Allen had. I told him that I was rehearsing and could not be bothered, and that really I did not care two-pence about it. He made no attempt to blackmail me.

But you were immediately kind to him?—Yes, I gave him half-a-sovereign.

And you began discussing with him what a beautiful manuscript and work of art the letter was?—Yes.

Did you tell this blackmailer that the letter was to be published as a sonnet?—Yes, I told Allen but not Cliburn. I told him it was to be published in an Oxford magazine, “The Spirit Lamp.” That was to show my indifference.

But you had got back the letter?—Yes.

Did you say to him: “I am afraid you are leading a wonderfully wicked life”?—Yes; I meant generally in being mixed up in this attempt to blackmail me.*

Did you ever have any of your beautiful letters,

* “Clibborn and Atkins were wonderful in their infamous war against life. To entertain them was an astounding adventure.”

except the one found out, turned into a sonnet?—I require to read a great deal of modern poetry before I can say.

Come, sir, answer the question. Can you tell me if one, except this, was ever turned into a sonnet?—Well, at the present moment I cannot recollect another.

Did you ever ask Lord Alfred Douglas to preserve that letter?—No.

And therefore you never thought of turning it into a sonnet till it was discovered?—I never did turn it into a sonnet. When the copy was sent to Mr. Beerbohm Tree and I saw it, I at once thought it would turn into a sonnet.

Were you staying at the Albemarle Hotel about the 26th of February, 1892?—Yes.

At that time were Messrs. Elkin Mathews and John Lane, of Vigo Street, your publishers?—Yes.

Did you become fond of their office boy?—I really do not think that that is the proper form for the question to be addressed to me in. I deny that that was the position held by Mr. Edward Shelley, to whom you are referring. I object to your description.

What age was Mr. Shelley?—I should think about twenty. I first met him in October when arranging for the publication of my books. I asked him to dine with me at the Albemarle Hotel.

Was that for the purpose of having an intellectual treat?—Well, for him, yes. We dined in my own sitting-room, and there was one other gentleman there. (Witness wrote down the name, which was handed to Counsel.)

On that occasion did you have a room leading into a bedroom?—Yes.

Did you give him whiskies and sodas?—I suppose that he had whatever he wanted. I do not remember. He did not stay all night, nor did I embrace him.

Witness absolutely denied that any improper conduct occurred.

Continuing, he said:—I invited him to my house and he dined with myself and my wife. He expressed great admiration for my works. I took him to the Exhibition at Earl's Court, to the Lyric Club, the Café Royal, and Kettner's, and also to the first night's performance at the Independent Theatre, and it may be he was at the Hogarth Club, of which I am not a member.

Did you ever give him money?—Yes; on three occasions—the first time £4, the second time his railway fare to Cromer, where I invited him to meet my wife and family, and the third time £5.

He did not go to Cromer, but kept the £3?—He did not go, and I wrote to him saying he was not to send back the money.

Did you think this young man of eighteen was a proper or natural companion for you?—Certainly.

Did you give him a signed copy of the first edition of "Dorian Gray"?—Yes.

Is this your writing? (Counsel handed up a copy of "The Sinner's Comedy," which was inscribed "From the Author to dear Edward Shelley.")—That was purely a piece of nonsense. I was not the author of the book.*

* *The Sinner's Comedy*, by John Oliver Hobbes (Mrs. Craigie), published in 1892.

Did you become intimate with a young lad named Alphonse Conway at Worthing?—Yes.

He sold newspapers at the kiosque on the pier? —No, I never heard that up to that time his only occupation was selling newspapers. It is the first I have heard of his connection with literature.

What was he?—He led a happy, idle life.

He was a loafer, in fact? How old was he?—He seemed to me to be just enjoying life. He was a youth of about eighteen.

How did you make his acquaintance?—When Lord Alfred Douglas and I were at Worthing we were accustomed to go out in a boat. One day when the fishermen were launching a boat on the high beach, Conway with another lad assisted in getting the craft down to the water. I said to Lord Alfred Douglas, “Shall we ask them to come out for a sail?” He assented, and we took them. After that Alphonse and I became great friends, and it is true that I asked him to lunch with me. He also dined at my house, and lunched with me at the Marine Hotel.

Was his conversation literary?—On the contrary, quite simple and easily understood. He had been to school where naturally he had not learned much.

He was a simple country lad?—He was a nice, pleasant creature. His mother kept a lodging-house, and his desire was to go to sea. It is not true that I met him by appointment one evening and took him on the road to Lancing, kissing him and indulging in familiarities on the way.

Did you give him anything?—Oh, yes, but no money.

Did you give him sums amounting to £15?—Never. I gave him a cigarette case in which I placed a paper inscribed, “Alphonse from his friend Oscar Wilde.” I called him “Alphonse,” but he did not call me “Oscar.” I also gave him my photograph on which I wrote “Oscar Wilde to Alphonse.” I also gave him a book called “The Wreck of the Grosvenor.”

These presents, and also a silver-mounted crook-handled grape-vine stick, were produced.

Were you fond of this boy?—Naturally. He had been my companion for six weeks.

Did you take the lad to Brighton?—Yes.

And provided him with a suit of blue serge?—Yes.

And a straw hat with a band of red and blue?—That, I think, was his unfortunate selection.

But you paid for it?—Yes.

You dressed this newsboy up to take him to Brighton?—No. I did not want him to be ashamed of his shabby clothes. He told me his father had been an electrical engineer, and had died young.

In order that he might look more like an equal?—Oh, no! He could not look like that. No, I promised him that before I left Worthing I would take him somewhere, to some place to which he wished to go, as a reward for his being a pleasant companion to myself and my children. He chose Portsmouth, as he was anxious to go to sea, but I told him that was too far. So we went to Brighton. We dined at a restaurant and stayed the night at the Albion Hotel, where I took a sitting-room and two bedrooms. I am

not sure that the bedrooms communicated by a green baize door. We returned next day. I have never taken any other boy to the Albion. I am quite certain of that.

I believe you have written an article to show that Shakespeare's Sonnets were suggestive of unnatural vice?—On the contrary, I have written an article to show that they are not.*

The court adjourned till the following day, the defendant being released on bail.

* *The Portrait of Mr. W. H.*, in *Blackwood's Magazine*, July, 1889. The subject was to have been more fully developed in *The incomparable and ingenious history of Mr. W. H., being the true secret of Shakespeare's sonnets now for the first time here fully set forth*, announced by Messrs. Mathews and Lane in 1894. The manuscript is stated to have been returned to Wilde's house on the day of his arrest and no trace of it has ever been discovered.

iv.—LORD QUEENSBERRY AT THE OLD BAILEY

The duel of wits between Mr. Carson and Mr. Oscar Wilde was resumed next morning, Thursday, April 4th, under practically the same conditions as before. Mr. Carson's first questions had reference to •Wilde's visits to Taylor's house at 13, Little College Street. It was there that Wood brought to Wilde the letters written to Lord Alfred Douglas. The prosecutor admitted attending afternoon tea parties at the house—a pastime, he added, of an extremely agreeable character. Mr. Carson was anxious to learn something of the manner in which Taylor's rooms were furnished. Wilde denied that they were luxurious, but was willing to concede that they were pretty. He was unaware that daylight was never admitted to the drawing-room, and could not say whether or no the heavy curtains had ever been drawn back from the windows. It was true that various kinds of perfumes were burned in the room—"a charming practice," added the witness *sotto voce*. The name of another mysterious youth—Sidney Mavor, was here introduced. Wilde had met him at Taylor's house, but he did not know his present whereabouts, and manifested some surprise when Mr. Carson stated that he had disappeared during the past week. Taylor, according to Mr. Wilde, was a nice man—artistic, clever and intellectual. He regarded

him simply as a friend. But Mr. Carson seemed to be very well informed as to Taylor's character, and asked whether it was not the fact that Taylor, together with one Charles Parker, was arrested in 1894 during a police raid on a house near Fitzroy Square. Wilde said this was so.

A telegram sent by Wilde to Taylor, asking for an appointment at the Savoy Hotel, was read. The explanation, given after a long pause, was that it was in connection with the attempt by Wood to extort blackmail for witness's letter to Lord Alfred Douglas.

Frederick Atkins was the name of another youth about whom Mr. Carson wanted to know. He, like most of the others, had been introduced to Mr. Wilde by Taylor, but Mr. Wilde would not have it that Taylor was a professional introducer of young men to men of greater age. In all Taylor had brought the witness into contact with several of these youths, who were either grooms, valets, or without employment. To all of them he had given money or presents, but had received nothing in return except the pleasure of their company. In a fine democratic spirit Mr. Wilde declared that he could become friendly with any human being, no matter what his position in life. He had given £4 or £5 to Parker "because the man was poor."

The court was deeply impressed with these statements of Mr. Wilde. Later, in reply to questions as to his dining at Kettner's Restaurant, where the best of everything was placed upon the table, with Charles and William Parker—a groom and a valet respectively—Mr. Wilde explained that he did so because it gave

him pleasure to be with those he loved and liked, whereat there was much suppressed laughter. He denied that after dinner he returned with Charles Parker to the Savoy Hotel, where he was staying, and gave him iced champagne. For some reason Mr. Wilde's sense of dignity was touched by this reference to champagne. Drawing himself up, with both hands plunged into his trousers pockets, he declared champagne to be his favourite beverage, against his doctor's orders.

The Marquis of Queensberry, who had been listening intently to the proceedings, here moved to the end of the dock, opposite Mr. Carson, in order that he might the better be able to follow the ruthless cross-examination to which the witness was being subjected.

Much time was occupied in tracing the movements of Charles Parker and recording the number of visits he paid to Mr. Wilde in his rooms at 10, St. James's Place. There were "tea parties" there, and Parker had received from Mr. Wilde a cigarette case. More than once the question of a cigarette case cropped up. All the young men with whom Mr. Wilde was on intimate terms appeared to have received cigarette cases, some of them inscribed "From his friend Oscar." It was always plain "Oscar." In fact, Mr. Wilde said he preferred being addressed in that manner, just as he himself always used the Christian names of his friends.

Mr. Wilde's dignity was again hurt when Mr. Carson suggested that witness had walked from his house in Tite Street to Chapel Street, the new residence of Taylor. With a curl of his lip he said he

never walked anywhere, and if the cab in which he had been riding was a good one he kept it outside the house at which he called. Again referring to the police raid in Fitzroy Square, Mr. Carson, after some trouble, drew from Wilde the admission that though he was greatly distressed at Taylor being mixed up with that affair, yet it made no difference to their friendship.

The court had been much mystified during the trial as to the identity of the gentleman who was referred to constantly as the one "whose name was written on the paper." Except that he was a "Mr. S.," a gentleman of position and high repute, and that he had been for some time out of England, nothing transpired. He seemed to have been on intimate terms with all Wilde's young friends, and to have been present at the numerous teas, luncheons, and dinners given in their honour. It was this anonymous gentleman who had arranged to take the youth Atkins to Paris, but in consequence of other engagements—the nature of which was not disclosed—he asked Wilde to do the honours for him. Mr. Wilde consenting, he and Atkins stayed for some days at an hotel in the Boulevard des Capucines. The auditors were at this point much amused at Mr. Wilde's narration of his refusal to allow Atkins to have his hair curled. It was suggested that Mr. Wilde was anxious that Atkins should place himself in the hands of a tonsorial artist, he having admittedly a great liking for artists of all descriptions. But he repudiated the insinuation, and protested that the desire was spontaneous on the part of Atkins. Even Mr.

Wilde himself appreciated the humour of the incident and joined in the laughter. Soon after, the witness had an opportunity of showing his knowledge of French. Mr. Carson was not quite accurate in his pronunciation of "Moulin Rouge," and he was smartly corrected by Mr. Wilde. There was also a suggestion that Mr. Wilde and Atkins occupied the same room in the house in Paris, but this was indignantly denied. Raising his voice, and bringing down his hand on the rail of the witness-box, Mr. Wilde declared it to be an infamous lie. After their return from Paris, Atkins visited Mr. Wilde at St. James's Place, but beyond the customary tea party there was nothing of importance in the visit; at least, so the witness asserted. In his part as benefactor Mr. Wilde had encouraged the ambition of Atkins to go upon the music-hall stage, and had even bought a song for him.

Brief reference was made to another youth, named Scarfe, who received a cigarette case as a token of his patron's friendship.

Throughout his long cross-examination Mr. Wilde kept his temper, but upon Mr. Carson asking whether he had at any time kissed a boy named Grainger, he became angry. With livid face, and glaring eyes, he shouted "No!" A sharp passage of arms then took place with reference to a remark of the witness that the boy was "ugly." Wilde declared that he used the word flippantly, and soon after this incident the cross-examination closed.

Sir Edward Clarke, in re-examining, read a number of letters that had passed between Lord Alfred

Douglas and his father. The repetition of the painful sentiments they contained had a marked effect on the man in the dock, who was visibly affected. His lips quivered, and he nervously grasped the dock for support. On the other hand, Wilde betrayed no feeling, but remained motionless, leaning across the rail of the witness-box, following closely every word of the correspondence. The reference to Lord Rosebery and Mr. Gladstone somewhat bewildered the auditors, but it was subsequently made clear that their names were dragged in in purely a political sense.

In re-examination, Sir Edward Clarke endeavoured to show that in all he did for the curious 'young men, whose names had been mentioned, the prosecutor was actuated by the highest motives.

A couple of questions was put to Mr. Wilde by one of the jury, and then his massive figure disappeared from the witness-box and from the court. It was not until Mr. Carson had proceeded a long way with his opening speech for the defence that Mr. Wilde returned to his seat at the table.

Mr. Carson's address was in his best vein. Alternately raising and lowering his voice, and here and there emphasising his remarks by striking with his hand the papers that lay before him, he thrilled his listeners by the earnestness of his words. He called upon the jury as fathers to say whether Lord Queensberry was not justified in endeavouring by every means in his power to rescue his son from the baneful domination of the prosecutor. There was something like painful surprise in court when Counsel stated that on the following day he would put

into the witness-box the young men with whom Mr. Wilde's name had been associated.

This was the second day of the hearing of the libel action brought by Mr. Oscar Wilde against the Marquis of Queensberry. The account of the first day's proceedings had aroused tremendous interest. "I never write anything that is not extraordinary," Mr. Wilde had said in the witness-box, and in addition to his extraordinary writings, the extraordinary character of some of his doings, as revealed by himself under cross-examination, had been highly "stimulative to thought," and had brought crowding into the Old Bailey corridors a bigger press of would-be hearers than ever.

The fame of the previous day's performance—it was little else—had gone abroad; the accounts of the strange attitude adopted by the "lover of the beautiful," who thought "books cannot be immoral," and was "not concerned to do good or evil but only to create the beautiful," had excited no less interest than the reports of the wonderful intellectual force and flow of perfect language with which he had defended his positions; and the curious tone of his epistolary prosconnets, and the bizarre nature of the choice of his chance acquaintances, had aroused a deeper interest still, which was mirrored in the packed court that patiently awaited the resumption of the trial in which this strange personality was nominally accusing a relentless pursuer of libel, but actually was defending himself against one of the gravest charges that could be brought against a man.

The members of the jury were quite early in

attendance, and had a great deal to say to each other, no doubt discussing the prosecutor's views on the "ordinary individual" who did not appeal to him, and of whom he had no knowledge.

Mr. Wilde, who had arrived early, sat looking at them raptly. It was hardly likely that he was giving play to his love of the beautiful, but probably was seeking to increase his stock of knowledge in respect of the "ordinary individual." He did not look so fresh or so bright as on the previous day.

The Marquis of Queensberry was also in court early. He came in just before Mr. Wilde, and took up a position close to the entrance to the dock. He gazed carelessly round the court, and once or twice let his eyes rest upon the prosecutor. Then he entered the dock and sat down. But when the Judge came into court the Marquis arose and assumed the erect attitude which he had observed throughout the first day's proceedings.

CROSS-EXAMINATION CONTINUED

On the Judge taking his seat, the prosecutor was immediately called into the witness-box, and Mr. Carson resumed his cross-examination.

Mr. Carson:—You told me yesterday that you were intimate with Taylor.

Witness:—Yes, and I continued intimate with him down to the present time. It was he who arranged the meeting of myself with Wood about the letters at his residence, 13, Little College Street. I have known Taylor since the early part of October, 1892. He

used to come to my house, to my chambers, and to the Savoy. I have been several times to his house, some seven or eight times, perhaps.

You used to go to tea parties there—afternoon tea parties?—Yes.

How many rooms did he occupy?—He had the upper part of the house—two stories. He had a bedroom, a sitting-room, a bath-room and a kitchen. I think he did not keep a servant.

Did he use to do his own cooking?—I don't know. I don't think he did anything wrong.

I have not suggested that he did.—Well, cooking is an art. •

Another art? Did he always open the door to you?—No; sometimes he did; sometimes his friends did.

Did his rooms strike you as being peculiar?—No, except that he displayed more taste than usual.

There was rather elaborate furniture in the room, was there not?—The rooms were furnished in good taste.

Is it true that he never admitted daylight into them?—Really, I don't know what you mean.

Well, was there always candle or gas light there?—No.

Did you ever see the rooms lighted otherwise than by gas or candles whether by day or night?—Yes, certainly.

Did you ever see the curtains drawn back in the sitting-room?—When I went to see Taylor it was generally in the winter about five o'clock—tea time—but I am under the impression of having seen him earlier in the day when it was daylight.

Are you prepared to say that you ever saw the curtains otherwise than drawn across?—Yes, I think so.

It would not be true, then, to say that he always had a double lot of curtains drawn across the windows, and the room, day or night, artificially lighted?—I don't think so.

Can you declare specifically that any daylight was ever admitted into the room?—Well, I can't say as to that.

Who was there when you went in the daylight?—I think Mr. Taylor only.

Can you recall any specific time at which you saw daylight enter that room?—Yes; it was a Monday in March. Nobody else was there. In the winter the curtains would naturally be drawn.

Were the rooms strongly perfumed?—Yes, I have known him to burn perfumes. I would not say the rooms were always perfumed. I am in the habit of burning perfumes in my own rooms.

Did you ever meet Wood there?—I saw Wood there only on one occasion when I met him at tea.

Did you ever meet a man named Sidney Mavor there?—Yes.

How old was he?—About twenty-five or twenty-six.

Is he your friend still?—Yes.

When did you see him last?—I have not seen him for about a year, when he dined with me.

Where is he now?—I have not the slightest idea where he is. Last Sunday I asked Mr. Taylor to go down to see Mr. Mavor's mother and tell him I

wanted to see him. I was told that Mavor was away. I was not told where he had gone.

Were you told that Mavor had disappeared within the last week?—No.

Have you found him since?—I don't know what you mean by "found him." Mr. Mavor has not called upon me, though I wish to see him.

Did you know that Taylor had a lady's costume—a lady's fancy dress—in his rooms?—No.

Did you ever see him with one on?—No. I was never told that he had such dresses. He is a man of great taste and intelligence, and I know he was brought up at a good English school.

Is he a literary man?—I have never seen any created work of his.

Did you discuss literature with him?—He used to listen. He was a very artistic, pleasant fellow.

Was he an artist?—Not in the sense of creating anything. He was extremely intellectual and clever, and I liked him very much.

Are you in the habit of constantly communicating with him by telegraph?—No. I have telegraphed to him. He was a friend of mine.

Did you get him to arrange dinners at which you could meet young men?—No.

But you have dined with young men?—Often. Ten or a dozen times, perhaps, at Kettner's, the Solferino, and the Florence.

Always in a private room?—Generally, not always; but I prefer a private room.

Did you send him this telegram—"Alfred Taylor, 13, Little College Street, S.W. Could you

call at six o'clock, Savoy?—Oscar"?—Yes.

What did you want him for?—I wanted him because I had received an anonymous letter saying that Alfred Wood was going to blackmail me in respect of certain letters stolen from Lord Alfred Douglas.

Again, you wired from Goring—“ Cannot manage the dinner to-morrow. Am so sorry. Oscar”?—Yes.

Did you send this telegram to Taylor—“ Obliged to see Tree at five o'clock, so don't come to Savoy. Let me know at once about Fred. Oscar”?—I do not recollect it.

Who was Fred?—A young man to whom I was introduced by the gentleman whose name was written down yesterday. His other name was Atkins.

What was it you wanted to know?—I cannot remember.

Were you very familiar with him?—I liked him. I never had any trouble about him.

Did Atkins call you “ Oscar”?—Yes. I called him “ Fred,” because I always call by their Christian names people whom I like. People I dislike I call something else.

Now, did you know that Taylor was being watched by the police?—No, I never heard that.

Do you know that Taylor and Parker were arrested in a raid upon a house in Fitzroy Square last year?—Yes.

Did you know Parker?—Yes. I don't think I ever saw him at Mr. Taylor's rooms in Little College Street, but I have seen him at Chapel Street, to which he removed.

Now, did you not know that Taylor was notorious for introducing young men to older men?—I never heard that in my life. He has introduced young men to me.

How many has he introduced to you?—Do you mean of those mentioned in this case?

No; young men with whom you afterwards became intimate?—About five.

They were young men whom you would call by their Christian names?—Yes.

Were these young men all about twenty?—Yes; twenty or twenty-two. I like the society of young men.

What was their occupation?—I do not know if these particular young men had occupations.

Have you given money to them?—Yes. I think to all five—money or presents.

Did they give you anything?—Me? Me? No!

Among these five did Taylor introduce you to Charles Parker?—Yes.

Did you become friendly with him?—Yes, he was one with whom I became friendly.

Did you know that Parker was a gentleman's servant out of employment?—No.

But if he were, you would still have become friendly with him?—Yes. I would become friendly with any human being I liked.

How old was he?—Really, I do not keep a census.

Never mind about a census. Tell me how old he was.—I should say he was about twenty. He was young, and that was one of his attractions.

Was he a literary character?—Oh, no.

Was he intellectual? Was he an educated man?—Culture was not his strong point. He was not an artist. Education depends on what one's standard is.

Where is he now?—I haven't the slightest idea. I have lost sight of him.

How much money did you give Parker?—During the time I have known him I should think £4 or £5.

Why? For what?—Because he was poor, and I liked him. What better reason could I have?

Did you ask what his previous occupation was?—I never inquire about people's pasts.

Nor their future?—Oh, that is problematical.

Sir Edward Clarke:—There is no use in arguing about that.

Mr. Carson:—Where did you first meet him?—At Kettner's. I was introduced by Mr. Taylor.

Did you become friendly with Parker's brother?—Yes. They were my guests, and as such I became friendly with them.

On the very first occasion that you saw them?—Yes. It was Taylor's birthday, and I asked him to dinner telling him to bring any of his friends.

Did you know that one Parker was a gentleman's valet, and the other a groom?—I did not know it, but if I had I should not have cared. I didn't care twopence what they were. I liked them. I have a passion to civilise the community.

What enjoyment was it to you to entertain grooms and coachmen?—The pleasure to me was being with those who are young, bright, happy, careless, and free. I do not like the sensible and I do not like the old.

Taylor accepted your invitation by bringing a valet

and a groom to dine with you?—That is your account, not mine.

Were they persons of that class?—I am surprised at your description of them. They did not seem to have the manners of that class. They seemed to me pleasant and nice. They spoke of a father at Datchet as a person of wealth—well, not of wealth but of some fortune. Charlie Parker told me that he was desirous to go on the stage.

Did you call him “Charlie”?—Yes.

What did you have for dinner?—Well, really I forget the menu.

Was it a good dinner?—Kettner’s is not so gorgeous as some restaurants, but it was Kettner at his best.

With the best of Kettner’s wines?—Yes, certainly.

All for the valet and the groom?—No; for my friends; for Mr. Taylor, whose birthday it was.

You did the honours to the valet and the groom?—I entertained Taylor and his two guests.

In a private room, of course?—Yes, certainly.

Did you give them an intellectual treat?—They seemed deeply impressed.

During the dinner did you become more intimate with Charlie than the other?—I liked him better.

Did Charles Parker call you “Oscar”?—Yes. I like to be called “Oscar” or “Mr. Wilde.”

You had wine?—Of course.

Was there plenty of champagne?—Well, I did not press wine upon them.

You did not stint them?—What gentleman would stint his guests?

What gentleman would stint the valet and the

groom? (Witness and his counsel protested against this remark.)

Now, after dinner, did you say, referring to Charles Parker, in the presence of Taylor and William Parker, the brother, "This is the boy for me"?—Certainly not.

And did you ask Charles, "Will you come with me?"—No. After dinner I went back to the Savoy Hotel, but I did not take Charles Parker with me.

Did you not drive him to the Savoy?—No, he did not come to the Savoy at all.

Did any of these men who visited you at the Savoy have whiskies and sodas and iced champagne?—I can't say what they had.

Do you drink champagne yourself?—Yes; iced champagne is a favourite drink of mine—strongly against my doctor's orders.

Never mind your doctor's orders, sir.—I never do.

Witness (continuing):—About a week later Charles Parker and Taylor dined with me at Kettner's again. The second dinner at Kettner's was arranged by myself. I first gave Parker money in December, 1893. I did not ask Taylor what these young men friends of his were. Sufficient for me that they were friends of his. Charlie Parker wished to go on the stage. What his brother's ambition was I never knew. Taylor did not tell me that he had met them in the St. James's Rooms. I had rooms at St. James's Place. Taylor wrote to me saying Charlie Parker was in town, and I replied asking him to come to tea. We had tea on the terrace. Parker came to tea five or six times there.

What was he doing there?—Visiting me. I liked

his society. Sometimes he came with Taylor, sometimes alone. I gave him a Christmas present—a silver cigarette case, not a gold chain ring. I also gave him £3 or £4, as he was hard up, and asked me if I could let him have the money. I don't think he was ever in my bedroom, unless I was putting on my coat to go out or something of that sort.

Did improprieties take place there?—None.

When he came to tea what was he doing all the time?—What was he doing? Why, having his tea, smoking cigarettes, and, I hope, enjoying himself.

What was there in common between this young man and yourself? What attraction had he for you?—I delight in the society of people much younger than myself. I like those who may be called idle and careless. I recognise no social distinctions at all of any kind; and to me youth, the mere fact of youth, is so wonderful that I would sooner talk to a young man for half-an-hour than be even—well, cross-examined in court.

Do I understand that even a young boy you might pick up in the street would be a pleasing companion?—I would talk to a street arab, with pleasure.

You would talk to a street arab?—If he would talk to me. Yes, with pleasure.

And take him into your rooms?—Be it so. I remember that Charles Parker lived at 7, Camera Square in Chelsea. I did not get him clothes. He has lunched with me at the Café Royal and at St. James's Place. I never went to see him at Camera Square. It is a very different thing his coming to tea with me and my going to see him. It would not have

been interesting for him to see me, while it was interesting for me to see him. I remember that Charles Parker was present at a dinner which I gave at the Solferino Restaurant. There was no one else present, and we dined in the public room.

Did you write him any beautiful letters?—I don't think I have ever written any letters to him.

Have you any letters of his?—Only one.

A letter from Parker was read:—“Am I to have the pleasure of dining with you this evening? If so, kindly reply by messenger or wire to the above address. I trust you can, and we can spend a pleasant evening.” The letter was signed “Yours faithfully.”

Sir Edward Clarke:—I should like to see the handwriting.

Mr. Carson:—We will see all about that. Parker himself will be here, which is better.

(To Witness):—In March or April of last year did you go one night to visit Parker at 50, Park Walk, about half-past twelve at night?—No.

Is Park Walk about ten minutes' walk from Tite Street?—I don't know, I never walk.

I suppose when you pay visits you always take a cab?—Always.

And if you visited, you would leave the cab outside?—If it were a good cab.

When did you see Charles Parker last?—I don't think I have seen him since February of last year.

Did you ever hear what became of him?—I heard that he had gone into the army—enlisted as a private.

You saw in the papers of the arrest of Taylor and Parker?—Yes; I read that they were arrested.*

You know that they were charged with felonious practices?—I knew nothing of the charges.

That when they were arrested they were in company with several men in women's clothing?—I read of it in the newspapers that two men, in women's clothes, music-hall artistes, drove up to the house and were arrested outside.

Did you not think it a somewhat serious thing that Mr. Taylor, your great friend, and Charles Parker, another great friend, should have been arrested in a police raid?—I was very much distressed at the time, and wrote to him, but the magistrates took a different view of the case, because they dismissed the charge. It made no difference to my friendship for him.

Was this same Taylor lunching with you on Tuesday last?—Not lunching. He came to my house to see me.

When did you first meet Fred Atkins?—In October, 1892. He told me he was connected with a firm of bookmakers. He was about nineteen or twenty. I was introduced to him in the rooms of a gentleman in Margaret Street, off Regent Street. I did not know him through making bets. I did not ask him to dinner on the first day I met him. I met him at a dinner given by another gentleman whose rooms I met him in first. I was friendly with Atkins on that occasion. I called him "Fred" and he called me "Oscar." He was in employment, but apologised and said he neglected his business.

Did he seem to you an idle fellow?—Well, yes. But he was ambitious to go on the music-hall stage. We did not discuss literature. I would not have allowed him to. The art of the music-hall was as far as he got.

Did you ask him to go to Paris with you?—I must explain. One Sunday I saw him and the gentleman, who has been mentioned, lunching at the *Café Royal*. I was going to Paris on my own account in reference to the publication of a book.* This other gentleman was also going to Paris about a position on *Dalziel's Agency*. It was suggested that we should all go together, as he had promised to take *Atkins*. It was arranged that we should go on Monday, but subsequently the gentleman found that he could not go until Tuesday or Wednesday. Then, as *Atkins* seemed very much disappointed, the gentleman asked me if I would take *Fred* over. I said, “With the greatest pleasure,” and I took him.

How long had you known *Atkins* then?—About a fortnight. We went by the Club train. I paid for his ticket, but the money was refunded to me afterwards by the gentleman. I did not suggest to *Atkins* that he should go as my secretary—ridiculous, it's childish to ask such a thing. I took him to the same rooms I occupied in the hotel—29, *Boulevard des Capucines*. I engaged three bedrooms, having one in reserve. They all three opened on to each other. I never asked *Fred* to copy some manuscript for me. I took him to lunch at the *Café Julien*. He was practically my guest, as representing the gentleman I have mentioned.

* *Salomé* published in Paris, February, 1893.

The examination was becoming terribly dreary to those who had heard the verbal flashes and sparkling sallies of the day before. Mr. Wilde seemed depressed and bored. Many of the additions to his answers were utterly lost through his habit of muttering them almost to himself, with an impatient exclamation, as if he were annoyed with the whole business.

Counsel :—After lunch did you suggest that Atkins should have his hair curled?

Witness :—He suggested it himself, and I said it would be very unbecoming, and I told him it was a silly thing to do, an absurd thing. I should have been very angry if he had had his hair curled.

Well, did he get his curled at Pascal's, the hairdresser, under the Grand Hotel?—I think not.

You dined with him?—Yes.

Gave him an excellent dinner?—I never had anything else. I do everything excellently.

Did you give him plenty of wine at dinner?—As I have said before, any one who dines at my table is not stinted in wine. If you mean, did I ply him with wine, I say “No!” It’s monstrous, and I won’t have it.

I have not suggested it.—But you have suggested it before.

After dinner did you give him a sovereign to go to the Moulin Rouge?—Yes. I went that night, I think, to a French theatre, and when I got back to the hotel Atkins had gone to bed.

The witness here denied any impropriety with Atkins in Paris, and added that it would be an infamous lie for anyone to say so.

Did the gentleman referred to arrive next day?—He came on the Wednesday, and we all three returned together. I gave Fred a cigarette case. I found him a pleasant, good-humoured companion, but I did not see much of him after I got to Paris, as I had business to look after. Shortly after getting back to London I was ill in bed, and I wrote to the gentleman to ask Atkins to call upon me at Tite Street. I don't think he came by himself.

Did you ask him to promise that he would say nothing about going to Paris?—No. I thought it was the great event of his life, as it was. I knew before going to Paris that Atkins was living in Pimlico. I have written several letters to Atkins this year, one enclosing him tickets for my play at the theatre. I went to Atkins's rooms to tea in February, 1894. On that occasion there was one other gentleman there—an actor. It was at Osnaburgh Street.

How old was he?—About twenty.

Did you give Atkins any money?—Yes: £3. 15s. to buy his first song for the music-hall stage. He told me that the poets who wrote for the music-hall never took less. I had the pleasure of meeting one of the poets.

Did you consider Atkins respectable?—Respectable? Yes. I thought him pleasant and young. He was good-natured, and was going on to the music-hall stage. I heard him sing. He was interesting.

Was he alone when he came to you at St. James's Place?—No; I think he was accompanied by the young actor. I will swear that Atkins was not alone in the room with me.

Did any improprieties ever take place between you and Atkins?—None whatever.

You knew a man named Ernest Scarfe?—Yes. He was introduced to me by Taylor. He is a young man of about twenty, of no occupation. He had been in Australia at the gold-diggings.

Did you know he was a valet and is a valet still?—No. I have never met him in Society, though he has been in my society, which is more important.

How did Taylor introduce this man Scarfe?—Well, Taylor told me he knew a young man who, on board ship going out to Australia, had met Lord Douglas of Hawick. He had introduced him to Lord Alfred Douglas at a skating rink. I asked Scarfe to dine with myself and Taylor at Kettner's. I did not afterwards take him back to my rooms at St. James's. I have never embraced, kissed or caressed him.

Why did you ask him to dinner?—Because I am so good-natured. It is a good action to ask to dinner those beneath one in social station.

Did you ever give Scarfe any money?—Never.

Did you give him any presents?—Yes, a cigarette case. It cost £4. It is my custom to present cigarette cases. I last saw Scarfe in February when he dined with me at the Avondale Hotel.

When did you first know Sidney Mavor?—In September, 1892. He was introduced to me by the same gentleman who introduced Atkins.

Do you know where that gentleman is now?—No. I have not heard of him for eighteen months or two years. I never gave Mavor any money, nor did I give money to Taylor to hand to Mavor. I don't think I

even gave him a cigarette case; but it may be true that on October 3rd I ordered Thornhill's in Bond Street to send him one of the value of £4 11s. 6d.

Did you tell them to send it?—Well, if it is there, perhaps I did.

But you had known him only a month?—Quite long enough to get to feel an interest in him.

Why did you give him a cigarette case when you had known him only a month?—I give what presents I like to anybody I like. Mavor stayed with me one night at an hotel in Albemarle Street in October, 1892. I asked him to stay with me for companionship, pleasure, amusement. I like to have people staying with me. I took two bedrooms, one for Mavor and one for myself. He never stayed with me another night. On the occasion referred to I was passing through London and I wanted his society, as he was a smart, pleasant young fellow.

And did you find pleasure in his society that night?—Yes, in the evening and at breakfast. It amused and pleased him that I should ask him to be my guest at a very nice, charming hotel.

On being shown a photograph of Mavor, witness said:—“Ah, taken at a period earlier than that at which I knew him.”

Mr. Carson then held up a cigarette case. “No, really,” the witness exclaimed, “I could not. I have given so many I could not recognise it.

Do you know Walter Grainger?—Yes.

How old is he?—He was about sixteen, when I knew him. He was a servant at a certain house in High Street, Oxford, where Lord Alfred Douglas had

rooms. I have stayed there several times. Grainger waited at table. I never dined with him. If it is one's duty to serve, it is one's duty to serve; and if it is one's pleasure to dine, it is one's pleasure to dine.

Did you ever kiss him?—Oh, dear no. He was a peculiarly plain boy. He was, unfortunately extremely ugly. I pitied him for it.

Was that the reason why you did not kiss him?—Oh, Mr. Carson, you are pertinently insolent.

Did you say that in support of your statement that you never kissed him?—No. It is a childish question.

Did you ever put that forward as a reason why you never kissed the boy?—Not at all.

Why, sir, did you mention that this boy was extremely ugly?—For this reason. If I were asked why I did not kiss a door-mat, I should say because I do not like to kiss door-mats. I do not know why I mentioned that he was ugly, except that I was stung by the insolent question you put to me and the way you have insulted me throughout this hearing. Am I to be cross-examined because I do not like it?

Why did you mention his ugliness?—It is ridiculous to imagine that any such thing could have occurred under any circumstances.

Then why did you mention his ugliness, I ask you?—Perhaps you insulted me by an insulting question.

Was that a reason why you should say the boy was ugly?—(Here the witness began several answers almost inarticulately, and none of them he finished. His efforts to collect his ideas were not aided by Mr. Carson's sharp staccato repetition: “Why? why?

why did you add that?"'). At last the witness answered:—You sting me and insult me and try to unnerve me; and at times one says things flippantly when one ought to speak more seriously. I admit it.

Then you said it flippantly?—Oh, yes, it was a flippant answer.

In reply to further questions, witness said:—No indecencies ever took place between myself and Mavor. I went down in June, 1893, to stay at a cottage at Goring. I brought over Grainger as under-butler. He had asked me to get him a situation. ~~T~~ never on any occasion asked him to come into my bedroom. I don't know where the butler I had then is now.

Counsel (continuing cross-examination):—Did you know a masseur at the Savoy named Antonio Migge?—Yes. He used occasionally to massage me in the morning. I stayed at the Savoy in March, 1893, but never on that occasion brought boys into my bedroom there.

Did you ever bring boys into your rooms at the hotel in Paris?—Never.

Or into your sitting-room?—What do you mean by boys?

Boys of eighteen or twenty?—Oh, yes; many called to see me.

Did any of them come late at night—twelve or one o'clock—and stay till four in the morning?—Certainly not.

An incident that is said to have occurred was put to the witness and absolutely denied. "It never occurred," he declared, "never, never." Other

questions were put to him containing criminal suggestions, only to be denied strenuously and absolutely with gestures of disdain and disgust.

The day but one after your return to London did you give Atkins a silver cigarette case?—I gave him one in Paris.

You say he called on you at Tite Street shortly afterwards?—Yes, he came with a gentleman I know. I thought it was very kind of Atkins to come. It is not everybody in the world who is grateful.

You paid for his lunch in Paris?—Certainly, I paid for his lunch.

He had not the means to pay himself?—Certainly not—not for the kind of lunch I like.

When you lunched with Wood at the Florence, before his departure for America, did you have champagne?—No champagne; I never drink in the middle of the day.

Where did you first meet Charles Parker?—At Kettner's.

Who introduced you?—Mr. Taylor.

Where is Parker now?—I don't know.

You never asked him his age?—I think it vulgar to ask people their age. He may have been sixteen or forty-five. Don't ask me. What is the use of cross-examining me on what I don't know.

Was the money that you gave him given to him all at once?—Yes, all at once.

And you gave him a silver cigarette case?—Yes.

What did he do when he came to tea with you?—You ask me what a youth would do?

What was Parker doing there?—Nothing.

Did you ever have a servant called "Ginger"?—
Oh, no.

"Ginger" was the nickname of a page-boy in
Wilde's employment.

Did you ever know a man named Preston who
was mixed up in the Cleveland Street scandal?—I
never heard of him.

You gave Alphonse Conway a walking-stick, didn't
you?—Yes.

It was a handsome stick for a boy of that class?—
I did not think myself that it was a beautiful stick.

You still deny that you made Atkins have his hair
curled in Paris?—I told him that it would be silly;
and I still think I was right in my opinion.

How did Taylor come to bring Scarfe to you?—
Shall I tell you? He brought him to my rooms at
St. James's Place—

The honour was quite unexpected?—It was no
shock, but I did not expect him. It was early in
the afternoon. I made an appointment for them to
dine with me on another day. I forgot whether it
was in a public or a private room.

What was Scarfe?—He was then employed as a
clerk in St. Paul's Churchyard.

"Only one question more," Mr. Carson said, and
the words must have been a welcome relief. It was an
unimportant question too. Mr. Wilde was asked if
he would know the waiter at a certain Paris hotel, and
he replied that he thought he would.

This concluded the cross-examination of the pro-
secutor.

Sir Edward Clarke began his re-examination by

handing the witness several letters, and asked him the question: Was it from these letters that you first learned that Lord Queensberry objected to your acquaintance with his son, Lord Alfred Douglas?

Witness:—Yes.

Counsel then proceeded to read the letters. The first, dated Sunday, April 1st, from Carter's Hotel, Albemarle Street, W., was addressed by Lord Queensberry to Lord Alfred Douglas. In it Lord Queensberry wrote:

ALFRED,—It is extremely painful for me to have to write to you in the strain I must; but please understand that I decline to receive any answers from you in writing in return. After your recent hysterical impudent ones I refuse to be annoyed with such, and I decline to read any more letters. If you have anything to say, do come here and say it in person. Firstly, am I to understand that, having left Oxford as you did, with discredit to yourself, the reasons of which were fully explained to me by your tutor, you now intend to loaf and loll about and do nothing? All the time you were wasting at Oxford I was put off with an assurance that you were eventually to go into the Civil Service or to the Foreign Office, and then I was put off with an assurance that you were going to the Bar. It appears to me that you intend to do nothing. I utterly decline, however, to just supply you with sufficient funds to enable you to loaf about. You are preparing a wretched future for yourself, and it would be most cruel and wrong for me to encourage you in this. Secondly, I come to the more painful part of this letter—your intimacy with this man Wilde. It must either cease or I will disown you and stop all money supplies. I am not going to try and analyse this intimacy, and I make no charge; but to my mind to pose as a thing is as bad as to be it. With my own eyes I saw you both in the most loathsome and disgusting relationship as expressed by your manner and expression. Never in my experience have I ever seen such a sight as that in your horrible features. No

wonder people are talking as they are. Also I now hear on good authority, but this may be false, that his wife is petitioning to divorce him for sodomy and other crimes. Is this true, or do you not know of it? If I thought the actual thing was true, and it became public property, I should be quite justified in shooting him at sight. These christian English cowards and men, as they call themselves, want waking up. Your disgusted so-called father,
QUEENSBERRY.

The reading of this document created a great sensation.

Sir Edward Clarke (to witness):—Is there any foundation for the statement that your wife was petitioning for a divorce?—Not the slightest.

Sir Edward Clarke then began to read the second letter to Lord Alfred Douglas from his father. It was dated April 3rd, and began, “ You impudent young jackanapes, I request that you will not send such messages to me by telegraph.”

Mr. Carson:—Read the telegram from Lord Alfred Douglas to his father.

Sir Edward Clarke read the telegram which was handed in. It was dated April 2nd, 1894.

To Queensberry, Carter's Hotel, Albemarle Street.
What a funny little man you are. Alfred Douglas.

The letter went on:—

If you send me any more such telegrams, or come with any impudence, I will give you the thrashing you deserve. Your only excuse is that you must be crazy. I hear from a man at Oxford that you were thought crazy there, and that accounts for a good deal that has happened. If I catch you again with that man I will make a public scandal in a way you little dream of; it is already

a suppressed one. I prefer an open one, and at any rate I shall not be blamed for allowing such a state of things to go on. Unless this acquaintance ceases I shall carry out my threat and stop all supplies, and if you are not going to make any attempt to do something I shall certainly cut you down to a mere pittance, so you know what to expect.

The next letter was from Lord Queensberry to Mr. Alfred Montgomery, the father of Lord Queensberry's first wife, to whom he was married in 1866, and who obtained a divorce from the Marquis in 1887.

The letter, which was dated July 6th, from Skindles, Maidenhead, was as follows:—

SIR,—

I have changed my mind, and as I am not at all well, having been very much upset by what has happened the last ten days, I do not see why I should come dancing attendance upon you. Your daughter is the person who is supporting my son to defy me. She won't write, but she is now telegraphing on the subject to me. Last night, after hearing from you, I received a very quibbling, prevaricating message from her, saying the boy denied having been at the Savoy for the last year; but why send the telegram unless he could deny that he had been there with Oscar Wilde at all? As a matter of fact he did, and there has been a stinking scandal. I am told they were warned off, but the proprietor would not admit this. This hideous scandal has been going on for years. Your daughter must be mad by the way she is behaving. She evidently wants to make out that I want to make out a case against my son. It is nothing of the kind. I have made out a case against Oscar Wilde and I have to his face accused him of it. If I was quite certain of the thing I would shoot the fellow on sight, but I can only accuse him of posing. It now lies in the hands of the two whether they will further defy me.

Your daughter appears now to be encouraging them, although she can hardly intend this. I don't believe Wilde will now dare defy me. He plainly showed the white feather the other day when I tackled him—damned cur and coward of the Rosebery type. As for this so-called son of mine, he is no son of mine, and I will have nothing to do with him. He may starve as far as I am concerned after his behaviour to me. His mother may support him, but she shan't do that here in London with this awful scandal going on. But your daughter's conduct is outrageous, and I am now fully convinced that the Rosebery-Gladstone-Royal insult that came to me through my other son, that she worked that—I thought it was you. I saw Drumlanrig here on the river, which much upset me. It shall be known some day by all that Rosebery not only insulted me by lying to the Queen, which makes her as bad as him and Gladstone, but also has made a lifelong quarrel between my son and I.*

Another letter was to Lord Alfred, a worse outpouring of madness than the others, with horrible language in it. It was dated from Scotland, August 21st, and was as follows:—

I have received your postcard, which I presume is from you, but as the writing is utterly unreadable to me, have been unable to make out hardly one sentence. My object of receiving no written communication from you is therefore kept intact. All future cards will go into the fire unread. I presume these are the "hyeroglyphics" (sic) of the O. W. posing—club, of which you have the reputation of being such a shining light. I congratulate you on your autography; it is

* Lord Queensberry was a representative peer for Scotland from 1872 to 1880, when he failed to obtain re-election. His eldest son, Viscount Drumlanrig, was private secretary to the Earl of Rosebery, and was created a peer of the United Kingdom, under the title of Baron Kelhead, in 1893, during Lord Rosebery's Administration. He thus had a seat in the House of Lords, to which his father was not entitled. Lord Kelhead died from a gun accident on October 8th, 1894.

beautiful, and should help you to get a living. I don't know what at, but, say, crossing-sweeping. My friend I am staying with has made out some of your letter, and wished to read it to me, but I declined to hear a word. However, according to his advice I shall keep it as a specimen, and also as a protection in case I ever feel tempted to give you the thrashing you really deserve. You reptile. You are no son of mine and I never thought you were.

QUEENSBERRY.

The next letter was another to Lord Alfred Douglas, and was a strange mixture of pathos and passion.

August 28th, '94.
26, Portland Place, W.

You MISERABLE CREATURE,—

I received your telegram by post from Carter's, and have requested them not to forward any more, but just to tear any up, as I did yours, without reading it, directly I was aware from whom it came. You must be flush of money to waste it on such rubbish. I have learned, thank goodness, to turn the keenest pangs to peacefulness. What could be keener pain than to have such a son as yourself fathered upon one? However, there is always a bright side to every cloud, and whatever is is light (sic). If you are my son, it is only confirming proof to me, if I needed any, how right I was to face every horror and misery I have done rather than run the risk of bringing more creatures into the world like yourself, and that was the entire and only reason of my breaking with your mother as a wife, so intensely was I dissatisfied with her as the mother of you children, and particularly yourself, whom, when quite a baby, I cried over you the bitterest tears a man ever shed, that I had brought such a creature into the world, and unwittingly had committed such a crime. If you are not my son, and in this christian country with these hypocrites 'tis

a wise father who knows his own child, and no wonder on the principles they intermarry on, but to be forewarned is to be forearmed. No wonder you have fallen a prey to this horrible brute. I am only sorry for you as a human creature. You must gang your ain gait. Well, it would be rather a satisfaction to me, because the crime then is not to me. As you see, I am philosophical and take comfort from anything; but, really, I am sorry for you. You must be demented; there is madness on your mother's side, and indeed few families in this christian country are without it, if you look into them. But please cease annoying me, for I will not correspond with you, nor receive nor answer letters, and as for money, you sent me a lawyer's letter to say you would take none from me, but anyhow until you change your life I should refuse any; it depends on yourself whether I will ever recognise you at all again after your behaviour. I will make allowance; I think you are demented, and I am very sorry for you.

QUEENSBERRY.

Throughout the reading of these letters the scene in court was one of the most painful and astounding character. Sir Edward Clarke read on imperturbably, just in the tone he would have read a bill of costs. But the Marquis of Queensberry stood up, gazing alternately at Mr. Wilde in one corner, and at someone in the opposite end of the court. Every now and then he turned to the man in the witness-box and ground his teeth and shook his head at the witness in the most violent manner. Then when the more pathetic parts of the letters came, defendant had the greatest difficulty, apparently, in restraining the tears that welled into his eyes and forced him to bite his lips to keep them back.

Sir Edward Clarke (continuing re-examination) :—

Your friendship, Mr. Wilde, with Lady Queensberry and the other son has continued to the present?— Yes. Having regard to the character of the letters, I thought it right to disregard entirely the wishes contained in them. The letters were brought to my knowledge some time ago by the persons who received them.

Examined by Sir Edward Clarke as to “Dorian Gray,” the witness said:—Mr. Walter Pater wrote me several letters about “Dorian Gray,” and in consequence of what he said I modified one passage. The book was very widely reviewed, among others by Mr. Pater himself.* I wrote a reply to the review that appeared in the “Scots Observer.”†

These letters were then read aloud by Sir Edward Clarke, as were also some long extracts from “Dorian Gray” as a set-off to the passages selected by Mr. Carson on the previous day. The following are among the more striking portions of Wilde’s letters to the “Scots Observer” :—

The pleasure that one has in creating a work of art is a purely personal pleasure, and it is for the sake of this pleasure that one creates. . . . If my work pleases the few I am gratified. If it does not, it causes me no pain.

An artist has no ethical sympathies at all. Virtue and wickedness are to him simply what the colours on his palette are to the artist.

Each man sees his own sin in Dorian Gray. What Dorian Gray’s sins are no one knows. He who finds them has brought them.

The critic has to educate the public; the artist has to educate the critic.

* *Bookman*, Vol. I., No. 2, November, 1891.

† See *Scots Observer*, Vol. IV., Nos. 85, 86, 89, 91, July 5, 12 August 2, 16, 1890.

Cultivated idleness seems to me to be the proper occupation for men.

It is a sad thing, but one wearies even of praise.

The English public likes tediousness, and likes things to be explained to it in a tedious manner.

In answer to further questions:—I first knew Alfred Taylor in October, 1893, through the gentleman who has been referred to. It is now two years since he has been in England, and I have not seen him in that time.

Is that gentleman a gentleman of position and repute?—Yes; a gentleman of good birth and repute. I knew that Taylor had lost a lot of money he had inherited, but that he still retained a share in some business. I knew that he was educated at Marlborough School.

Had he any accomplishments?—Yes; he played the piano very charmingly.

Had you at the time of your introduction to him, or since, had any reason to believe that he was a disreputable and immoral person?—None whatever. I understood that the charge against Taylor and others, in connection with the Fitzroy Street raid, was for assembly at the place for unlawful and felonious purposes. He told me the occasion was a benefit concert, and that he was asked to play the piano. I read of the charge in the “Daily Chronicle.”

Did you gather what they were charged with?—Oh, yes, yes.

What was the charge?—So far as I could gather they were charged with being there for an unlawful purpose.

You were much distressed?—Yes.

He wrote you a letter?—He told me that he had been given a ticket for the concert. Two men came in women's dress to take part in the concert, and the police immediately broke in and arrested everybody in the place.

Was any impression left on your mind that Taylor was at all to blame?—Certainly not. I thought it monstrous.*

Who introduced you to Mr. Shelley?—I was introduced to the youth Shelley by Mr. John Lane, whose firm, Mathews and Lane, was publishing one of my books. I regarded Shelley as a very interesting personality. He was thirsting after information, and

* Eighteen men were taken into custody by the police in a midnight raid in Fitzroy Street on Sunday, August 12, 1894, two of them being men in feminine clothing. The prisoners were taken to Tottenham Court Road Police Station, and were brought up at Marlborough Street before Mr. Hannay, the magistrate, on the following morning. Amongst them were Charles Parker, 19, of no occupation, 72, Regent Street, Chelsea; Alfred Taylor, 32, no occupation, of 7, Camera Square, Chelsea; John Watson Preston, 34, general dealer, 46, Fitzroy Street, W., the proprietor of the raided premises; and Arthur Marling, 26, of 8, Crawford Street. The last named was described as a female impersonator, and was charged with being an idle and disorderly person. He appeared in court dressed in a fantastic female garb of black and gold.

Detective-Sergeant Kane told how, with Superintendent Sheppard, he proceeded to 46, Fitzroy Street, on the previous night between eleven and twelve o'clock, and saw cabs drive up with men. Two of the prisoners (Marling being one) were in a hansom, dressed as women, one with a fan. A man in ordinary clothes sat on their laps. Mr. Hannay asked Superintendent Kane if he had any idea of the object of the masquerade. Kane replied, "I have, sir." Marling said his business was to impersonate women at the halls, and the proprietor of the club at 46, Fitzroy Street, Mr. Preston, asked him to go and sing at his house in feminine attire, and he agreed. Mr. Hannay granted a remand for a week. He said there seemed to be something more than suspicion against five of the men found in the basement, but for the rest he would like to have some-

had literary tastes. He admired my works, and I acknowledged that by sending him copies.*

It appears that in the copies which have been produced the flyleaf has been torn out. Did you write in those or in any other books anything that you would object to the whole world seeing?—Never in my life.

At this point the court adjourned for luncheon. The Judge returned at two o'clock, but the hearing of the case did not at once proceed, as Mr. Wilde was not back from luncheon. Eventually he came when the occupants of the court had acquired quite an excited impatience for his return. On entering the witness-box prosecutor said, "My lord, pray accept my apologies for being late in the witness-box." He explained that it was due to the clock being wrong at the hotel where he had been lunching.

thing more definite in the charge when the accused next came before him. Superintendent Sheppard, in reply, said, "They are most of them known, your worship." Some of the accused were then released on their own recognisances; others had to find sureties in the sum of £5.

On the hearing of the case being resumed on Monday, ¹ August 20th, Marling and another were bound over to keep the peace for three months. Taylor and Parker were amongst those who were discharged unconditionally. Five men were ordered to find sureties in the sum of forty shillings each to be of good behaviour for one month. The magistrate said that whatever suspicion there might be, there was no evidence against the majority of the prisoners. He had had a number of letters informing him that many of the men were of the vilest possible character, but no one had come forward to give evidence to that effect.

* Mr. John Lane, formerly a partner in the firm of Elkin Mathews and John Lane, who was in New York at this time, cabled denying the statement that he had introduced Shelley to Mr. Wilde. They became acquainted, he said, when Shelley was in the employment of Mr. Mathews. Mr. Lane never introduced anyone to Mr. Wilde. Their relations were entirely of a business nature.

Sir Edward Clarke then read several letters from Shelley which Mr. Wilde had found among his papers. These letters were all of the friendly tone of a young admirer of the poet. One thanked him for the seats at the theatre on the first night of the production of "Lady Windermere's Fan."* It contained the words: "Such beauty of form and wit adds new flavour to life. How miserably poor everything seems beside it, except your books, but your books are part of yourself." "B— is of the same opinion," the letter went on. "He is a charming fellow." Mr. Wilde preferred not to say who B— was, simply because he wished to avoid paining a family with whom he was on terms of the greatest friendship. Witness had written to B—, "an intellectual young fellow will sit next to you. Talk with him."

Other letters were descriptive of Shelley's admiration for "The Sphinx"† and for "Salomé,"‡ and described great hardships which Shelley said he had to endure. Mr. Wilde assisted Shelley in obtaining a situation, and had lent him money. One of these letters of Shelley read: "I want to go away and rest somewhere. I am preparing to live a Christian life, and I accept poverty as part of my religion, but I must have health." Mr. Wilde again lent him money and helped him.

* *Lady Windermere's Fan* was produced at the St. James's Theatre on February 20, 1892.

† *The Sphinx* was published in June, 1894.

‡ The French edition of *Salomé* was published in February, 1893; the English edition, with illustrations, in February, 1894.

In reply to a question by Sir Edward Clarke, Wilde said that in answer to a letter from Shelley he gave him £5 to enable him to go away for a change of air.

Sir Edward Clarke :—Were there ever any relations between you and Edward Shelley except the relations of a man of letters with a man who admired his poetry and works, and one with whom he had come in contact?—Never, on any occasion.

Questioned as to the boy Alphonse Conway, Wilde said :—The lad expressed an intense desire to go to sea. I consulted a friend of mine who had many ships, and I wrote to Conway and told him the result of my inquiries.

Sir Edward Clarke :—Did you ever hear that he had been employed as a newspaper boy?—No, I never heard that he was connected with literature in any form.

Did Mrs. Wilde see Conway?—Oh, yes, constantly. The boy became a great friend of my sons. He used to go out fishing and sailing and bathing with me and my sons and my sons' friends.

How long did you stay at Worthing?—About two months, but I was not there continuously.

Did you have a house at Worthing?—Yes, a furnished house. My wife and boys were there most of the time.

Have you seen Conway since you left Worthing?—No, but I have written to him with reference to his going as an apprentice on a ship.

Witness then denied any unlawful practices with Alphonse Conway.

When did you first see Wood?—At the end of

January, 1893. It was at the Café Royal. I understood that he had been a clerk.

As for Wood, Lord Alfred Douglas had asked witness to do what he could for him, and he did. He had no idea, none whatsoever, of what had been the occupation of Charles Parker and his brother.

Sir Edward Clarke:—Have you ever seen Charles Parker in the Savoy?

Witness:—Never in my life.

With regard to Walter Grainger, how long was he in your service?—About three months.

Was he in ill-health during the greater part of that time?—Yes.

Sir Edward Clarke:—Now, as to these several persons to whom you were introduced, had you any reason to suspect them of being immoral or disreputable persons?—None whatever. Beyond reading the statements in the papers about the raid in Fitzroy Street I never saw any intimation that there was anything immoral in the nature of the young men; and in that case the men were discharged.

How was it that after the interview with Lord Queensberry on June 30th, and the letters that came to your knowledge, you did not then take steps against Lord Queensberry?—On account of the strong pressure put upon me by the Queensberry family, which I did not feel myself able to resist. On the Wednesday following the Saturday on which Lord Queensberry's visit occurred, I had an interview with a member of the Queensberry family, a gentleman who was also a Member of Parliament.

At the request of Mr. Carson the following post-

card from Lord Alfred Douglas to Lord Queensberry was put in.

Sir Edward Clarke objected, but the Judge ruled in Mr. Carson's favour, and the card was read.

As you return my letters unopened I am obliged to write on a post-card. I write to inform you that I treat your absurd threats with absolute indifference. Ever since your exhibition at O. W.'s house I have made a point of appearing with him at many public restaurants, such as the Berkeley, Willis's Rooms, the Café Royal, etc., and I shall continue to go to any of these places whenever I choose and with whom I choose. I am of age and my own master. You have disowned me at least a dozen times and have meanly deprived me of money. You have therefore no right over me either legal or moral. If O. W. was to prosecute you in the criminal courts for libel you would get seven years' penal servitude for your outrageous libels. Much as I detest you I am anxious to avoid this for the sake of the family; but if you try to assault me I shall defend myself with a loaded revolver which I always carry; and if I shoot you, or he shoots you, we should be completely justified, as we should be acting in self-defence against a violent and dangerous rough, and I think if you were dead not many people would miss you.—A. D.

Sir Edward Clarke remarked that if he had known the post-card was legible he would not have objected.

The following correspondence between Mr. Oscar Wilde's solicitors and the Marquis of Queensberry was then read:—

Giltspur Chambers,
Holborn Viaduct, E.C.,
July 11th, 1894.

MY LORD MARQUIS,—

We have been consulted by Mr. Oscar Wilde with reference to certain letters written by your lordship, in which letters you have most foully and infamously libelled

him, and also your son, Lord Alfred Douglas. In these letters your lordship has mentioned exalted personages, and Mr. Oscar Wilde, not being desirous to wound their feelings by a publication of your letter, has instructed us to give you the opportunity of retracting your assertions and insinuations in writing, with an apology for having made them. If this be done at once it may prevent litigation, but unless done forthwith no other course will be left open to us but to advise our client as to the proper course to adopt to vindicate his character.

Awaiting your reply by return of post,

We have the honour to be, etc.,

C. O. HUMPHREYS, SON, & KERSHAW.

Skindles,
Maidenhead,
July 13th.

SIR,—

I have received your letter here with considerable astonishment. I certainly shall not tender to Mr. Oscar Wilde any apology for letters I have written to my son. I have made no direct accusation against Mr. Oscar Wilde, but desired to stop the association as far as my son is concerned.

Yours faithfully,
QUEENSBERRY.

Skindles,
Maidenhead Bridge,
July 18th.

SIR,—

Since seeing you this morning I have heard that the revolver has been given up. I shall therefore not insist on taking the step I threatened to do to-morrow morning of giving information to the police authorities. However, if this is to go on, and I am to be openly defied by Mr. Oscar Wilde and my son by further scandals in public places, I shall have no other resort but to do as

I have threatened and give information at Scotland Yard as to what has happened.

Yours faithfully,

QUEENSBERRY.

After these communications had been read, the jury wanted to put some questions, which were first submitted in writing to the Judge. Mr. Wilde was asked whether the editor of "The Chameleon"—was a personal friend of his. He was not; Mr. Wilde had met him only once.

He had never seen the editor of "The Chameleon" at the time the latter wrote to witness from Oxford and asked him to contribute to that magazine. Witness subsequently saw him in the month of May in a friend's rooms. Witness had written to the editor to say that he really had nothing to give him at all.

"Afterwards," continued the witness, "I said that I would give him some aphorisms out of my plays. Some of them were unpublished. Some of those quoted yesterday are out of the play at present being performed at the Haymarket,* and there have been no complaints at the box-office of any moral depreciation of the audience."

Was "The Chameleon" for private circulation?—
Oh, no.

Sir Edward Clarke:—We will hand in a copy. Only one hundred copies were to be printed. They were for the public.

Was Mr. Wilde aware of the character of the story,

* *An Ideal Husband*, produced at the Haymarket Theatre, January 3rd, 1895.

“ The Priest and the Acolyte ”?—He was not. It came upon him as a great shock.

Then at five minutes to three Mr. Wilde stepped down from the witness-box and left the court.

More correspondence between the Marquis of Queensberry and Mr. Wilde's solicitors, which led up to the prosecution, was read with a view to publishing the fact that the “ exalted persons ” mentioned were not mentioned in relationship with the charges made against Mr. Wilde by the Marquis of Queensberry. The references were entirely of a political nature.

Sir Edward Clarke then said that the evidence for the prosecution was “ closed for the present ”—a qualification to which Mr. Carson objected.

Sir Edward Clarke said that he reserved to himself the power to claim to call evidence to rebut anything that might be sprung upon him.

His Lordship said that, broadly put, the case for the prosecution must close now, but at his discretion he might admit some other evidence.

SPEECH FOR THE DEFENCE

Mr. Carson then opened the case for the defence.

Lord Queensberry, he said, withdrew nothing he had said or written, nor any charge he had made in reference to the case. He had done all those things with a premeditation and a determination, at all risks and hazards, to try to save his son. Lord Queensberry's conduct had been quite consistent throughout, and if the allegations made against Mr. Wilde were correct, then, Counsel submitted, his lordship was

justified in taking any steps that would put an end to the disastrous acquaintance his son had formed. Counsel was glad that Sir Edward Clarke had read the letters mentioning the names of distinguished persons. It had been suggested that the names of those distinguished persons were in some way or other mixed up in Lord Queensberry's letters with the charges against Mr. Wilde. The references were of a purely political character, arising out of the fact that the late Lord Drumlanrig, the eldest son of the Marquis, was made a member of the House of Lords, of which his father was not a member. Rightly or wrongly, Lord Queensberry felt aggrieved that an honour should have been conferred on his son which was not given to him. That was how the names of eminent politicians and statesmen came to be mentioned.

From beginning to end Lord Queensberry, in dealing with Mr. Oscar Wilde, had been influenced by one hope alone—that of saving his son. What was Mr. Wilde's own case? The prosecutor said that up to a certain date he was on terms of friendship with Lord Queensberry, and therefore there were no circumstances rendering his lordship liable to the accusation that what he had done in the present case was done from malice arising out of disagreement. Lord Queensberry came to know of Mr. Wilde's character, of the scandals in connection with the Savoy Hotel, that the prosecutor had been going about with young men who were not coequal with him in position or in age, and that he had been associating with men who, it would be proved beyond doubt,

were some of the most immoral characters in London.

Counsel referred above all to the man Taylor, a most notorious character (as the police would tell the court), who occupied rooms which were nothing more or less than a shameful den. Whether Taylor was or was not a procurer in this sense, the fact remained that on Tuesday last (April 2nd) he was in company with Mr. Wilde at the latter's house in Tite Street, and that he had not been produced by the prosecution.

Taylor had been the right-hand man of Mr. Wilde in all the orgies in which artists and valets had taken part; and if opportunity had only been given of cross-examining him it might have been possible to get from him at least something as to what was going on at Fitzroy Square on the night of the raid. Taylor was really the pivot of the case, for the simple reason that when the various witnesses for the defence were called and examined (as unfortunately would be necessary) as to the practices of Mr. Oscar Wilde, it would be found that it was Taylor who introduced the young men to the prosecutor. Mr. Oscar Wilde had undertaken to prove enough to send Lord Queensberry to gaol and to brand him as a criminal, but it was remarkable that the only witness who could have supported Mr. Wilde's asseverance of innocence had not been called. Yet Taylor was still a friend of Mr. Wilde, and nothing, said the prosecutor, had happened to interrupt their friendship. It would be painful to be compelled to ask the various witnesses that would be called to describe the manner in which Mr. Wilde had acted towards them; but before the

case was ended the jury would be obliged to hear a good deal more of the extraordinary den which Taylor kept in Little College Street.

Therefore, it was above all things necessary, when they had so much proved by his own admissions, that Mr. Wilde should bring any witness he could to bear out his own explanations. They had heard a great deal of a gentleman whose name was written down. On each occasion when it was convenient to introduce somebody, this was the name which Mr. Wilde gave, because he was out of the country. But Taylor was still in the country.

Let them contrast the position which Mr. Wilde took up in cross-examination as to his books with the position he assumed as to the young men to whom he was introduced and those he picked up for himself. His books were written by an artist for artists; his works were not for Philistines or illiterates. But contrast that with the way in which Mr. Wilde chose his companions. He took up with Charles Parker, a gentleman's servant, whose brother was a gentleman's servant; with young Alphonse Conway who sold papers on the pier at Worthing; and with Scarfe, also a gentleman's servant. Then his excuse was no longer that he was dwelling in regions of art, but that he had such a noble, such a democratic soul that he drew no social distinctions, and that it was quite as much pleasure to have the sweeping-boy from the streets to lunch or dine with him as the greatest *littérateur* or artist. He (Mr. Carson) considered the positions absolutely irreconcilable. He thought that if the case had rested alone on Mr. Wilde's literature Lord

Queensberry would have been absolutely justified in the course he had taken. Lord Queensberry undertook to prove that Mr. Wilde was "posing" as guilty of certain vices. Mr. Wilde never complained of the immorality of the story, "The Priest and the Acolyte": he knew no distinction, in fact, between a moral and an immoral book, nor did he care whether the article was in its very terms blasphemous. All that Mr. Wilde says was that he did not approve of the story from a literary point of view. What was that story? It was the story of the love of a "priest" for the "acolyte" who attended him at "mass." Exactly the same idea that ran through the two letters to Lord Alfred Douglas ran through that story and through "Dorian Gray." And when the boy was discovered in the "priest's" bed* the "priest" made exactly the same defence as Mr. Wilde made—that the world does not understand the beauty of this love. The same idea ran through those two letters which Mr. Wilde called "beautiful" but he (Counsel) called an abominable piece of disgusting immorality.

Moreover there was in this same "Chameleon" a poem which showed some justification for the frightful anticipations which Lord Queensberry entertained for his son. The poem was written by Lord Alfred Douglas, and was seen by Mr. Wilde before its publication. Was it not a terrible thing that a young man on the threshold of life, who had for several years been dominated by Oscar Wilde, and had been "adored and loved" by Oscar Wilde, as the two

* There is no such suggestion in the story.

letters proved, should thus show the tendency of his mind upon this frightful subject? What would be the horror of any man whose son wrote such a poem?

Passing to "Dorian Gray," Counsel described it as the tale of a beautiful young man who, by the conversation of one who had great literary power and ability to speak in epigram—just as Wilde had—and who, by reading of exactly the same kind as that in "Phrases and Philosophies for the Use of the Young," has his eyes opened to what they were pleased to call "the delights of the world."* If "Dorian Gray" was a book which it could be conclusively proved advocated the vice imputed to Mr. Wilde, what answer then was there to Lord Queensberry's plea of justification?

Mr. Carson then read long extracts from "Dorian Gray" with a view of maintaining that his contention as to the tendency of that book was right.

The turning of the letter of Wilde to Lord Alfred Douglas into a sonnet was a very thinly veiled attempt to get rid of the real character of that letter. Then, what was the cause of the strained relations between Wilde and Wood? When he (Counsel) stated that previous to the possession of those letters Wood had been carrying on certain practices with Wilde the jury would have the key to the whole situation. That was one reason why Wilde would be anxious to get the letters at any cost; and when Wood came to levy

* *The Standard*, on October 20th, 1908, in reviewing the Volume of "Miscellanies" in the first collected edition of Wilde's works, said: "One of the most sparkling contributoins is the chapter on 'Phrases and Philosophies for the Use of the Young,'" and quoted several of these very epigrams in which Mr. Carson professed to see veiled improprieties.

blackmail, then Mr. Wilde became very anxious that the man should leave the country. He was, accordingly, shipped to America; and, no doubt, Mr. Wilde hoped never to hear of him again. But, as a matter of fact, Wood would be examined before the jury.

Counsel had some difficulty, he continued, in understanding why his learned friend, Sir Edward Clarke, had referred to that letter at all. Perhaps he thought the defence had the letter, and that it was better to give an explanation of it; but if that was so it was futile, because for the letter which the defence did produce his learned friend had no explanation. Sir Edward Clarke had referred to "a man named Wood" as being supposed to have taken out of a pocket of Lord Alfred Douglas correspondence which had passed between him and Wilde. Why, Wood was "Fred," one of Wilde's bosom companions, one of the Little College Street lot.

The name of Mr. Beerbohm Tree had been introduced into the case in respect to the sonnetised letter. He (Mr. Carson) had received a cablegram from Mr. Tree that morning mentioning the fact that the association of his name with the case had already been published in America, and Mr. Tree gave an explanation substantially the same as Mr. Wilde had given. Counsel thought that the way Mr. Tree had acted in the case was perfectly right when he received a copy of the letter.

Sir Edward Clarke:—I quite agree.

The Judge:—There is not the slightest ground for any suggestion against Mr. Beerbohm Tree. He acted in the matter with the most perfect propriety.

Mr. Carson:—Thank you, my lord. My view is that his action was exactly what it ought to have been.

Mr. Carson, continuing his speech, observed that Mr. Tree sent for Mr. Wilde and gave him the copy of the letter. Then Wilde began to think, when the letter was discovered, how he should get out of it. A short time afterwards Allen, the black-mailer, called and had a most extraordinary conversation with Wilde, who then said he had made up his mind to publish the letter as a sonnet. When did he make up his mind? Not when he sent it to Lord Alfred Douglas, for he did not ask him to preserve it. He (Counsel) envied the credulity of the jury if they believed that that abominable composition was written as a sonnet. That beautiful sonnet happened to be disclosed to the public. The other three were destroyed. That one had been made known to the public by being sent to Mr. Tree, and it was an extraordinary thing that it was the only letter which Mr. Wilde intended to turn into a sonnet. Counsel could see no difference between that letter and the letter which Mr. Wilde wrote from the Savoy Hotel, where it would be proved he had misbehaved.

Mr. Carson proceeded to read again the letter in which Wilde addressed Lord Alfred Douglas as “Dearest of all Boys,” and ended by subscribing himself “Your own Oscar.” He (Counsel) was not there to say that anything had ever happened between Lord Alfred Douglas and Mr. Oscar Wilde. God forbid! But everything showed that the young man was in a dangerous position in that he acquiesced in

the domination of Mr. Wilde—a man of great ability and attainments. Against that letter written by Mr. Wilde to Lord Queensberry's son Lord Queensberry protested; and were they, for that protest, to send Lord Queensberry to gaol? Lord Queensberry was determined to bring the matter to an issue: and what other way was open to him than that which he had chosen?

Before the jury condemned Lord Queensberry let them read Wilde's letters and say whether the gorge of any father ought not to rise. Lord Queensberry had acted deliberately and was not afraid of the issue which he had raised in that court. When the jury had heard Wood's evidence, the whole story of the payment of those sums of money by Wilde, and the mystery of those letters would be explained, and the suggestion that they were valuable manuscripts which Wilde desired to obtain would be dissipated. As a matter of fact, Wilde knew that we had all the evidence, and he preferred to discount it as far as possible in advance.

The learned Counsel had not concluded his speech when the court rose and adjourned till the following morning.

Lord Queensberry was again admitted to bail on his own recognisances in the sum of £500.

v.—CONCLUSION OF THE CASE AND VERDICT

Friday, April 5th, was the third day of the trial at the Central Criminal Court, before Mr. Justice Henn Collins and a special jury, of the Marquis of Queensberry on a charge of publishing a libel against Mr. Oscar Wilde. As on the two previous occasions, the small dingy court was crowded. Curiosity was as strong as ever, and brought together, if possible, a larger crowd than that which on the two preceding days had filled the court. The interest taken in the proceedings continued unabated. No sooner were the doors opened than the public gallery was again besieged. In the body of the court there was not that eager rush for seats on the part of the junior Bar that had been apparent on the Wednesday and Thursday; but each day, in the miserable hour of waiting that preceded the sitting of the court, the scene was curiously the same. Everyone was in the same seat, wedged in the same angle, or standing in the same corner. Not a face seemed missing that was present on the morning the trial began. At ten o'clock the gangways were not blocked, however, as had hitherto been the case, and it seemed obvious that more stringent efforts were being taken by the officials of the court to prevent the inconvenient crushing and crowding which had been a characteristic feature since the action commenced. As the time

wore on, Lord Queensberry entered and leaned with nonchalance against the dock; and after looking about him for a moment, climbed inside and sat down to read a newspaper, pending the arrival of the Judge. Everyone looked for the prosecutor, who did not put in an appearance in court, though several letters addressed to him at the Old Bailey were waiting for him. His solicitor sat chatting with Sir Edward Clarke. When the Judge took his seat he was handed a telegram, which he read slowly.

The prosecutor was represented by Sir Edward Clarke, Q.C., M.P., Mr. Charles Mathews, and Mr. Travers Humphreys. Mr. Edward Carson, Q.C., M.P., Mr. C. F. Gill, and Mr. A. Gill were for the defence. Watching briefs were held by Mr. Besley, Q.C., and Mr. Monckton.

When the court rose on the previous day, Mr. Carson had not finished his opening address to the jury. Resuming, he said that he hoped he had sufficiently demonstrated to the jury on the previous day that Lord Queensberry was absolutely justified in bringing to a climax the connection of Mr. Oscar Wilde with Lord Alfred Douglas. It would, however, be his painful duty to bring before the jury the young men, one after the other, who had been in the hands of Mr. Wilde, to tell their unhappy tales. It was, even for an advocate, a very distasteful task. But let those who were inclined to condemn these young men for being dominated, misled, and corrupted by Mr. Wilde, remember the relative positions of the two parties. Let them say whether those young men were not more sinned against than

sinning. There was a startling similarity in all the cases that had been raised against Mr. Wilde. In each they found no equality of age, education, or position with Wilde. But on the other hand there was a curious similarity in the ages of the young men themselves.

Wilde had said there was something beautiful and charming about youth which had led him to adopt the course of life he did in relation to young men. But was Mr. Wilde unable to find more suitable companions, at the same time young and charming, in the ranks of his own class? Why, the thing was absurd. Wilde's excuse on that ground was only a travesty of truth. Who were all these young men—these lads? There was Wood. Of his history, Mr. Wilde had told them he knew nothing. So far as Mr. Wilde knew, Wood was a clerk out of employment. Who was Parker? Mr. Wilde professed the same ignorance as to that youth. Who was Scarfe? Exactly in the same way Mr. Wilde knew nothing of him. He only knew that he was out of employment. Alphonse Conway he picked up by chance on the beach at Worthing. All the young men introduced to Mr. Wilde were of something like eighteen or twenty years of age. The manner of their introduction, and the way in which they were subsequently treated with money and presents, all led up to the conclusion that there was something unnatural in the relations between Mr. Wilde and these young men. Take the case of Parker. How did Mr. Wilde get to know that young man? Parker was a gentleman's servant out

of employment; and what idea could Taylor have had of Mr. Wilde's tastes when, on being invited by Wilde to ask his friends to a birthday dinner, he introduced as his guests a groom and a valet? If it were true, as undoubtedly it was, that Taylor first met the two young men in a restaurant in Piccadilly, why did he—if he knew that Mr. Wilde was an artistic and a literary man, and, what was more, an upright man—bring the couple to dine with Mr. Wilde? There could be no explanation of the facts but this: that Taylor was a procurer for Wilde, as he undoubtedly was.

Parker would be called to tell his unfortunate story—his story that he was poor, out of place, and that he fell a victim to Mr. Wilde. Upon the first occasion that Mr. Wilde met Parker, the valet, he addressed him as "Charlie," and Charlie addressed Mr. Wilde, the distinguished dramatist, whose name at the time was being mentioned in the highest circles in London for his plays and his literary work, as "Oscar."

Counsel did not wish to say anything about Mr. Wilde's theories as to putting an end to social distinctions. A man of noble and generous instincts might be able to break down all social barriers; but there was one thing plain in this case, and that was that Mr. Wilde's conduct to the young men introduced to him was not instigated by any generous instincts. If Mr. Wilde wanted to assist Parker, if he were interested in him, if he wanted to find him employment, was it doing the lad a good turn to take him to a restaurant and prime him with cham-

pagne and a good dinner? Was that the sort of charity and sympathy one would expect a man in Mr. Wilde's position to extend to another man like Parker? All the ridiculous explanation of Mr. Wilde would not bear one moment's explanation as to what he was doing in his suite of rooms at the Savoy. The Savoy was a large place, with plenty of room to move about in, and there was no doubt that, without leading people to suspect anything, Mr. Wilde could have brought young men into his rooms. Parker would tell them that when he went to the Savoy with Mr. Wilde he had whiskies and sodas and iced champagne—that iced champagne in which Mr. Wilde indulged contrary to his doctor's orders. Parker would furthermore tell the jury of the shocking acts he was led by Mr. Wilde to perpetrate on that occasion. Mr. Wilde had been asked in cross-examination, "Is it not true that there has been a scandal at the Savoy Hotel?" "None whatsoever," said Mr. Wilde. But about that very extraordinary thing Lord Queensberry had referred in his letter dated April, 1894. It might have been that no one had seen Mr. Wilde turned out into the street; but such kind of gossip could not have arisen without going abroad and being reported in the circles in which Lord Queensberry mixed. The wonder was not that the gossip reached Lord Queensberry, but that, after it was known, this man Wilde could have been tolerated in society in London for the length of time he was. Well, he (Counsel) should prove that Mr. Wilde brought boys into the Savoy Hotel. The masseur of that establishment—a most

respectable man—and other servants would be called to prove the character of Mr. Wilde's relations with his visitors. Was there any wonder that reports of a scandal at the Savoy should have reached Lord Queensberry, whose son was living a portion of the time at the hotel?

Mr. Wilde had not ventured to deny that Parker had dined with him, had been in his company, and had lunched with him at his rooms and at the Savoy. Mr. Wilde, seeing the importance of these facts, had made a clean breast of it. "Oh, yes," he said, "they were perfectly innocent, nay, more, they were generous actions on my part." It was remarkable that Mr. Wilde had given no account as to what he was doing in those rooms at the Savoy.

Parker had enlisted, continued Counsel, but would come forward, a most reluctant witness. As to the boy Conway: Conway was not procured by Taylor—he was procured by Mr. Wilde himself. Was there ever confessed in a court of justice a more audacious story than that confessed to by Mr. Wilde in relation to Conway? He met the boy, he said, on the beach at Worthing. He knew nothing whatsoever about him, excepting that he assisted in launching the boats. Conway's real history was that he sold newspapers at Worthing at the kiosk on the pier. What a flippant answer was it that Mr. Wilde gave to the question, "Did you know that Conway sold newspapers?" when he replied, "I did not know that he had had previous connection with literature"? Perhaps, in that, Mr. Wilde thought he was clever at repartee, and was scoring off Counsel whose duty

it was to cross-examine him. But there were the facts. After helping Mr. Wilde to get out his boat, an intimacy sprang up, and within a day or two Conway was taken by Mr. Wilde to the house he was occupying. If the evidence of Mr. Wilde was true—and Counsel sincerely hoped it was not—Conway was introduced to Mrs. Wilde and her two sons, aged nine and ten. Now, it was clear that Mr. Wilde could not take about the boy Conway in the condition he found him in. So what did he do? And it was here that the disgraceful audacity of the man came in. Mr. Wilde procured the boy a suit of clothes to dress him up like a gentleman's son, put some Public School colours upon his hat, and generally made him look like a lad fit and proper to associate with Mr. Oscar Wilde. The whole thing in its audacity was almost past belief. Why, if the defence had proved the fact, instead of getting it from the mouth of the prosecutor, the jury would have said it was almost incredible. But why did Mr. Wilde dress up Conway? If Mr. Wilde were really anxious to assist Conway, the very worst thing he could have done was to take the lad out of his proper sphere, to begin by giving him champagne luncheons, taking him to his hotel, and treating him in a manner in which the boy could never in the future expect to live.

* SIR EDWARD CLARKE INTERPOSES

At this point Sir Edward Clarke was seen to pluck Mr. Carson by the gown, and the indulgence of the court was asked for while Counsel consulted. Mr.

Wilde was not present in court, but he was in the building. Sir Edward Clarke and his junior, Mr. Mathews, had both been out of court for an interval before this surprise came. After a few moments' whispering, Mr. Carson resumed his seat, and Sir Edward Clarke rose and said:—

May I claim your lordship's indulgence while I interpose to make a statement, which, of course, is made under a feeling of very great responsibility?

My learned friend, Mr. Carson, yesterday addressed the jury upon the question of the literature involved in this case, and upon the inferences to be drawn from the admissions made with regard to letters written by Mr. Oscar Wilde; and my friend began his address this morning by saying that he hoped that yesterday he had said enough in dealing with those topics to induce the jury to relieve him from the necessity of dealing in detail with the other issues in this case. I think it must have been present to your lordship's mind that those who represent Mr. Wilde in this case have before them a very terrible anxiety. They cannot conceal from themselves that the judgment that might be formed on that literature, and upon the conduct which has been admitted, might not improbably induce the jury to say that Lord Queensberry in using the word "posing" was using a word for which there was sufficient justification to entitle the father, who used those words under these circumstances, to the utmost consideration and to be relieved of a criminal charge in respect of his statement. And with this in our clear view, I and my learned friends associated with me in this matter,

had to look forward to this—that a verdict given in favour of defendant upon that part of the case might be interpreted outside as a conclusive finding with regard to all parts of the case. And the position in which we stood was this: that, without expecting a verdict in this case, we should be going through, day after day, an investigation of matters of the most appalling character.

Under these circumstances I hope your lordship will think I am taking the right course, which I take after communicating with Mr. Oscar Wilde. That is to say that, having regard to what has been referred to by my learned friend in respect to the matters connected with the literature and the letters, I feel we could not resist a verdict of not guilty in this case—not guilty having reference to the word “posing.” Under these circumstances I hope you will think I am not going beyond the bounds of my duty, and that I am doing something to save, to prevent, what would be a most horrible task, however it might close, if I now interpose and say on behalf of Mr. Oscar Wilde that I would ask to withdraw from the prosecution. And if you do not think that at this time of the case, and after what has taken place—if you do not think I ought to be allowed to do that on his behalf, I am prepared to submit to a verdict of not guilty, having reference, if to any part of the particulars at all, to that part of the particulars connected with the publication of “The Picture of Dorian Gray” and the publication of “The Chameleon.” I trust that this may make an end of the case.

Mr. Carson:—I do not know that I have any right whatever to interfere in any way with this application my learned friend has made. I can only say, as far as Lord Queensberry is concerned, that if there is a plea of not guilty, a plea which involves that he has succeeded in his plea of justification, I am quite satisfied. Of course, my learned friend will admit that we must succeed upon the plea in the manner in which he has stated; and that being so, it rests entirely with your lordship as to whether the course suggested by my learned friend is to be taken.

The Judge:—Inasmuch as the prosecutor in this case is prepared to acquiesce in a verdict of not guilty against the accused, I do not think it is any part of the function of the judge or of the jury to insist on going through prurient details which can have no bearing upon a matter already concluded by the assent of the prosecutor to an adverse verdict. But as to the jury putting any limitation upon the verdict of justification of the charge, which is “posing as a sodomite”—if that is justified, it is justified; if it is not, it is not. And the verdict of the jury must be “Guilty” or “Not Guilty.” There can be no terms and no limitations. The verdict must be “Guilty” or “Not Guilty.” I understand him to assent to a verdict of Not Guilty, and of course the jury will return that.

Mr. Carson:—Of course, the verdict will be that the plea of justification is proved, and that the words were published for the public benefit.

Sir Edward Clarke:—The verdict is “Not Guilty.”

The Judge :—The verdict is “ Not Guilty,” but it is arrived at by that process. I shall have to tell the jury that justification was proved; and that it was true in substance and in fact that the prosecutor had “ posed ” as a sodomite. I shall also have to tell them that they will have to find that the statement was published in such a manner as to be for the public benefit. If they find on these two points, the verdict will be “ Not Guilty.”

A few seconds later the Judge, turning to the jury, added : Your verdict will be “ Not Guilty ”; but there are other matters which have to be determined with reference to the specific finding of complete justification, and, as I told you, that involves that the statement is true in fact and substance, and that the publication is for the public benefit. These are the facts on which you will have to find, and if you find them in favour of the defendant, your verdict will be “ Not Guilty.” You will have to say whether you find complete justification has been proved.

THE VERDICT

After a few moments’ consultation together on the part of the jury, the foreman intimated that they had arrived at their verdict that the libel was true.

The Clerk of Arraigns :—Do you find the plea of justification proved?

The Foreman of the Jury :—Yes.

And that it was published for the public benefit, and that the accused is not guilty?

Yes.

And that is the verdict of you all?

Yes.

Mr. Carson:—Lord Queensberry may be discharged?

Mr. Justice Collins:—Oh, certainly.

Lord Queensberry at once stepped out of the dock and joined his solicitor in the well of the court.

Mr. Carson said he presumed that the costs of the defence would follow the verdict.

Mr. Gill and Mr. Mathews, with their long Old Bailey experience, reminded him that that followed by Act of Parliament.

There remained nothing further but the formal discharge of the accused. Long before this, congratulatory handshaking had been going on, the Marquis leaning over the dock to reach the hands of his beaming friends. There was some applause in court, which was not immediately suppressed, the officials of the court only half-heartedly attempting to stop the cheers.

Mr. Oscar Wilde went to the Old Bailey during the morning, but he did not enter the court. He had a consultation with Sir Edward Clarke in a room off the court, and while the learned Counsel was making his statement to the Judge, Mr. Wilde left the building.

vi.—**SEQUEL TO THE OLD BAILEY PROCEEDINGS**
OSCAR WILDE ARRESTED

At the conclusion of the trial of Lord Queensberry at the Old Bailey, on Friday, April 5th, Mr. Oscar Wilde, after a consultation with his Counsel (Sir Edward Clarke and Mr. Charles Mathews) in an upper room of the Central Criminal Court—the consultation which led to the abrupt termination of the case—left in a brougham drawn by two brown cobs. He was driven to the Holborn Viaduct Hotel, where he had reserved a large sitting-room. In a few minutes he was joined by Lord Douglas of Hawick, Lord Alfred Douglas, and another gentleman. Luncheon was served, and finished shortly before three o'clock, after which all left the hotel, and, entering a carriage, drove to the offices of Sir George Lewis, in Ely Place, where Mr. Wilde delivered a note. Re-entering the carriage, Mr. Wilde drove back to the hotel, where Lord Douglas of Hawick and his brother took a cab, which Mr. Wilde followed in his brougham. They drove to Fleet Street, and thence to St. James's Square, where Lord Alfred Douglas cashed a cheque at the London and Westminster Bank. Mr. Wilde, in his brougham, did not stop, but drove straight to the Cadogan Hotel, in Sloane Street, where, shortly afterwards, he was joined by Lord Douglas of Hawick and Lord Alfred Douglas.

Wilde was followed the whole time by two detectives employed by Lord Queensberry. They made little or no attempt to conceal their mission, and eventually took up their position at the corner of 76, Sloane Street, opposite the hotel.

It may here be mentioned that immediately after the acquittal of Lord Queensberry at the Old Bailey, his solicitor, Mr. Charles Russell, sent the following letter to the Director of Public Prosecutions:—

37, Norfolk Street,
Strand, W.C.

April 5, 1895.

Hon. Hamilton Cuffe,
Director of Prosecutions.

Re Oscar Wilde.

DEAR SIR,

In order that there may be no miscarriage of justice I think it my duty at once to send you a copy of all our witnesses' statements together with a copy of the short-hand notes of the trial.

Yours faithfully,

CHARLES RUSSELL.

Just after the House of Commons met, a representative of the Public Prosecutor had an interview with the Home Secretary (Mr. H. H. Asquith), the Attorney-General (Sir Robert Reid, Q.C.), and the Solicitor-General (Sir F. Lockwood, Q.C.) in reference to the case. It was at once agreed that a warrant should be applied for, and Mr. Asquith gave instructions that wherever Wilde might be found he should be stopped.

Mr. Oscar Wilde sent the following letter to the

Editor of the "Evening News" to explain his action in withdrawing from the prosecution against Lord Queensberry :—

Holborn Viaduct Hotel,

London, E.C.

April 5, 1895.

To the Editor of the *Evening News*.

SIR,

It would have been impossible for me to have proved my case without putting Lord Alfred Douglas in the witness-box against his father. Lord Alfred Douglas was extremely anxious to go into the box, but I would not let him do so. Rather than put him into so painful a position, I determined to retire from the case, and to bear on my own shoulders whatever ignominy and shame might result from my prosecuting Lord Queensberry.

Yours, etc.,

OSCAR WILDE.

The papers from Mr. Charles Russell were delivered at the Treasury, Whitehall, and about an hour afterwards there came a request that Mr. Russell would proceed at once to an interview with Mr. Hamilton Cuffe, the Director of Public Prosecutions. Mr. Russell attended accordingly, and the information which he laid was evidently of a serious nature, since a request was forthwith sent to Scotland Yard for the immediate attendance of a detective-inspector. Accordingly Detective-Inspector Brockwell presented himself at the Public Prosecutor's Offices in Whitehall. Shortly afterwards, that officer, in company with Mr. Angus Lewis, proceeded to Bow Street, where, about 3-30 p.m., they had a private interview with Sir John Bridge, the chief magistrate, to discuss

the action which should be taken. To his worship, the allegations laid before him seemed to be so grave that he adjourned his court, and, taking a cab, accompanied Mr. Angus Lewis and Detective-Inspector Brockwell to the Treasury. There Sir John Bridge examined the whole of the documents forwarded by Mr. Russell, which contained the statements of witnesses who would have been called by Mr. Carson at the Old Bailey if the case had not been interrupted. After examining the documents, Sir John Bridge returned to Bow Street, and on the strength of what he had ascertained at the Treasury, at once signed a warrant for the arrest of Mr. Oscar Wilde. Inspector Brockwell immediately returned to Bow Street and had the warrant handed to him, and on his going to Scotland Yard he caused communication to be made to all the district stations of the metropolis that Oscar Wilde was "wanted by the police."

It should be noted that Wilde would have had plenty of time to leave the country had he wished to do so; but apparently he was so confident of being acquitted, that he was determined to remain and face any charges that might be made against him. It is to be regretted that Wilde was not persuaded by his friends to go abroad—at least, for a time—until the violent prejudice which had been imported into the case, and worked up against him by the baser section of the gutter Press of London, had calmed down. However, he was informed by a journalist that a warrant had been issued for his arrest, and he waited at the hotel for whatever developments might arise.

The "Echo," a London evening paper of the period, published the following leading article that afternoon:—

LORD QUEENSBERRY.

And so a most miserable case is ended. Lord Queensberry is triumphant, and Mr. Oscar Wilde is "damned and done for." He may now change places with Lord Queensberry, and go into the dock himself, and have Lord Queensberry's evidence against him. He appears to have illustrated in his life the beauty and truthfulness of his teachings. He said, in cross-examination, that he considered there was no such thing as morality, and he seems to have harmonised his practice with his theory. The counsel for the prosecution, the judge, and jury are entitled to public thanks for abruptly terminating the trial, and so preventing the publication of probably revolting revelations.* The best thing for everybody now is to forget all about Oscar Wilde, his perpetual posings, his æsthetical teachings, and his theatrical productions. If not tried himself, let him go into silence, and be heard of no more.

About half-past six that evening Detective-Inspector Richards and Detective-Sergeant Allen, to whom the warrant had been handed, took a cab to the Cadogan Hotel, Sloane Street, where Mr. Wilde was staying. On arrival at the hotel they asked the hall porter if Mr. Oscar Wilde was staying there. The porter answered in the affirmative, but stated that Mr. Wilde could not be seen. They notified, however, that they were police officers, and demanded to be shown to his room. The porter sent for a waiter, who conducted the two detectives to room No. 53, where Wilde was found to be.

He was seated in an armchair by the fireplace,

* The following day this paper published what it called a "detailed report" of the police court proceedings.

calmly smoking a cigarette. Two friends who were with him were sitting by a table, on which were glasses of hock and seltzer. Wilde raised inquiring eyes to the intruders, and Inspector Richards said, "Mr. Wilde, I believe?" Wilde languidly replied, "Yes, yes?" The floor of the room was strewn with copies of the evening papers, which had evidently been hastily scanned and then thrown aside.

Inspector Richards said, "We are police officers, and hold a warrant for your arrest." Wilde replied, "Oh, really?" Inspector Richards added, "I must ask you to accompany me to the police station," and to Wilde's inquiry as to where he was to be taken, the Inspector answered, "To Scotland Yard, and then to Bow Street." Asking if he would be able to obtain bail, Wilde was told that that was a matter for the magistrate to decide.

Wilde then said, "Well, if I must go, I will give you the least possible trouble," and putting on his overcoat and taking his hat and gloves, he announced that he was ready to accompany the officers. Then entering a four-wheeled cab, the party was driven *via* Hobart Place, Buckingham Palace Road, and St. James's Park to Scotland Yard.

Subsequently Wilde was taken to Bow Street about eight o'clock and placed, like other alleged criminals, in the station dock. The warrant upon which he had been arrested was read over to him. It charged him with committing acts of gross indecency with other male persons on March 20th, 1893, and divers other dates. Leaning on the side of the dock, Wilde smiled and made no reply to the charges; but he asked

that the dates might be repeated. Inspector Digby thereupon read the charge over again.

He was searched, according to the police regulations, and then conveyed to one of the ordinary cells of the station.

Shortly after Wilde's arrival at Bow Street, a friend of his drove up with a small Gladstone bag containing a change of clothes and other necessaries which Wilde had asked for before leaving the Cadogan Hotel. After a short interview with the inspector on duty, the gentleman returned to the cab with the bag, as he was not allowed to leave it. Later, Lord Alfred Douglas visited Bow Street to see if he could bail Mr. Wilde out, and was much distressed when informed that on no consideration could his application be entertained. He was also refused to be allowed to bring in extra comforts in the way of bedding and food. Mr. Wilde was, however, permitted to supply himself with any food he wished from outside.

The Central News Agency was authorised to issue the following statement:—

Lord Queensberry states that as soon as the trial ended he sent this message to Mr. Oscar Wilde: "If the country allows you to leave all the better for the country. But if you take my son with you, I will follow you wherever you go and shoot you."

The next day Lord Queensberry issued from Carter's Hotel a statement that he had not been correctly reported. "The message," he said, "was sent some days ago, and not after the trial. Lord Queensberry did not say he would shoot Mr. Wilde.

What he said was that if he persuaded his misguided son to go with him he would feel quite justified in following him (Wilde) and shooting him, did he feel inclined to do so, and were he worth the trouble."

Messrs. Ward, Perks, and McKay, of 85, Grace-church Street, E.C., solicitors, sent the following letter to the Press, with regard to "The Chameleon":—

On behalf of Messrs. Gay and Bird, the publishers of the first and only number of this publication, we ask you to be good enough to allow us to say through your columns that our clients of their own accord stopped the sale directly they were aware of the contents of the magazine. Such sale was not stopped at the request of a contributor or any one else. They were requested to renew the sale and refused. Had the trial proceeded, we should, at the proper time, have tendered our clients to give the above facts in evidence.

At the time of Oscar Wilde's arrest two of his plays were being performed in London, namely, "An Ideal Husband" at the Haymarket, and "The Importance of Being Earnest" at the St. James's Theatre. The one hundred and eleventh, and last, performance of the former had some weeks previously been announced to take place on Saturday, April 6th. At the St. James's Theatre "The Importance of Being Earnest" was continued until May 8th, when the eighty-sixth, and last, performance took place, but the author's name was removed from all advertisements and programmes after the day of his arrest, both in London and in America.

The history of Section xi of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, xlviii and xlix Victoria, cap. 69, is as follows: There was passed in the House of Lords at the beginning

of May, 1885, "An Act to make further provision for the Protection of Women and Girls, the Suppression of Brothels, and other purposes." The Bill was read a first time in the House of Commons on May 6th; it passed the second reading on July 9th without discussion and was referred to a Committee of the whole House. On August 6th, when the Bill was in Committee (as stated in Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Third Series: Vol. ccc, page 1398) :—

MR. LABOUCHERE said he rose to move a clause he had put upon the Paper—

MR. WARTON rose to order. He wished to ask whether the clause about to be moved by the hon. member for Northampton, and which dealt with a totally different class of offence to that against which the Bill was directed, was within the scope of the Bill?

MR. SPEAKER: At this stage of the Bill anything can be introduced into it by leave of the House.

MR. LABOUCHERE said his amendment was as follows:—
After Clause 9, to insert the following clause:—

Any male person who, in public or private, commits, or is a party to the commission of, or procures or attempts to procure the commission by any male person of, any act of gross indecency with another male person, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and, being convicted thereof, shall be liable, at the discretion of the Court, to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding one year with or without hard labour.

That was his amendment, and the meaning of it was that at present any person on whom an assault of the kind here dealt with was committed must be under the age of 13, and the object with which he had brought forward his clause was to make the law applicable to any person, whether under the age of 13 or over that age. He did not think it was necessary to discuss the proposal at any length, as he understood Her Majesty's Government were willing to accept it. He, therefore, left it for the House and the Government to deal with as might be thought best.

New Clause (Outrages on public decency)—(Mr.

Labouchere)—brought up, and read the first and second time.

MR. HOPWOOD said, he did not wish to say anything against the clause, but he would point out that under the law as it stood at the present moment the kind of offence indicated could not be an offence in the case of any person above the age of 13, and in the case of any person under the age of 13 there could be no consent.

SIR HENRY JAMES said the clause proposed to restrict the punishment for the offence dealt with to one year's imprisonment, with or without hard labour. He would move to amend the clause by omitting the word "one," in the last line of the clause, and substituting the word "two."

MR. LABOUCHERE had no objection to the amendment. Clause, as amended, *agreed to*, and *added* to the Bill. The Act came into force on January 1st, 1886.

II.—THE SECOND TIME

“ . . . The second time to be led back to the house of detention. . . . ”

II.—THE SECOND TIME

vii.—OSCAR WILDE IN CUSTODY—PROCEEDINGS AT BOW STREET

On Saturday, April 6th, 1895, Oscar Fingall O'Flahertie Wills Wilde, who was arrested at the Cadogan Hotel, Sloane Street, on the previous evening, was charged before Sir John Bridge, at Bow Street, on a charge of a very grave kind.

For half an hour before the doors opened a large crowd had gathered in front of the court, but only those having professional duties to discharge, the witnesses, and a few friends of the accused, were admitted. These were at first allowed to take their seats in the large court, but after an interval of more than half an hour, it was announced that the case would be taken in the Extradition Court, and a rush was made for places in that small and inconvenient room. A small number of the general public was subsequently admitted.

Mr. Wilde, who was brought into the court at eleven o'clock, wore a black frockcoat and dark trousers. He showed no great concern at any time during the proceedings.

After a whispered inquiry of the constable standing by him, he sat down in the dock, with one arm outstretched along the back rail and the elbow of the other arm resting on the end rail.

The prisoner was charged on a warrant under

section xi. of the Criminal Law Amendment Act (xlviii., xlix., Vict., c. 69)* with the committal of and the inciting to the committal of certain offences therein provided against, namely, that he being a male person, did, on March 20th, 1893, and divers other dates, unlawfully commit divers acts of gross indecency with another male person, to wit, one Charles Parker.

Mr. C. F. Gill, instructed by Mr. Angus Lewis, of the Treasury, appeared on behalf of the Public Prosecutor. Mr. Travers Humphreys represented the accused.

Mr. Gill, in opening the case, said that he was there to prosecute the prisoner on a series of charges of inciting to commit or committing certain gross acts provided against under the eleventh section of the Criminal Law Amendment Act. No good purpose would be served by going into those matters in an opening speech; he would merely indicate generally the character of the evidence he proposed to produce before the magistrate, and the nature of the charges, while the question of what the prisoner would ultimately be committed upon would depend on the nature of the evidence produced.

The first charge related to the conduct of the prisoner with the young man, Charles Parker, in 1893. Wilde was then staying at the Savoy Hotel,

* By the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885, xlviii and xlix Victoria, cap. 69, section xi., for a male person either in public or private, to commit or be a party to the commission, or to procure or attempt to procure the commission, by any male person of any act of gross indecency with another male person, is a misdemeanour punishable by imprisonment for not more than two years with hard labour.

where he lived for some weeks till March 29th; and at the same time there was living at a place in Little College Street, Westminster, a man named Alfred Taylor. He was a man closely connected with the prisoner Wilde, and the evidence would disclose that he was a person acting for Wilde and procuring him young men. Prisoner would be charged with conspiring with that man to procure lads. Prisoner was in the habit of visiting that man Taylor at Little College Street, and his worship would have evidence as to what took place at that address, where the prisoner Wilde was in the habit of going. Taylor occupied the upper part of No. 13 in that street. Parker was a servant out of place, and had been a yalet, and was in company with his brother William when they met Taylor at the St. James's Restaurant. Taylor was a stranger to them; he stood them drink and invited them to visit him at Little College Street. Having got them to that place, he made certain suggestions to them, and mentioned Mr. Oscar Wilde as a man to whom he would introduce them. They met Wilde at a dinner at Kettner's, when Wilde made a selection of Charles Parker, and went with him to the Savoy Hotel. The date of this was about the 13th or 14th of March of that year.

The learned Counsel described what was alleged to have taken place there, and on subsequent occasions at two other addresses, with Wilde.

Mr. Gill then told of how Wilde took Parker about in cabs to luncheons, and dinners, and music-halls, of a trip to the Crystal Palace and to other places. During the whole time that the intimacy lasted

between the prisoner Wilde and Charles Parker, the former was giving the latter money. Counsel went on to describe Taylor's room at Little College Street, and to say that the whole story of Parker would be proved indisputably in the box, and might even be corroborated by the prisoner Wilde himself, who was eligible to give evidence, and whose story in another place was a corroboration of the evidence that would be laid before the magistrate that day. Two incidents Counsel would prove occurred at the Savoy Hotel, incidents of a scandalous character, and others took place at other hotels, and even at the prisoner's house in Tite Street. Step by step the story of Parker would be proved up to the hilt. The police knew of the horrible business carried on by the man Taylor, but the detectives experienced difficulty in getting the necessary evidence.

Wilde gave Parker money, and visited him where he lived in Camera Square, till a woman noticing the appearance of the man Wilde—which once seen was not likely to be forgotten—caused such trouble that Parker had to leave. Parker was now living a respectable life, and came forward as a most unwilling witness; but he had to do so. The learned Counsel added that there was a number of other cases which would be gone into. The prisoner had already had an opportunity of giving his version of the affair, and he could do so again if he chose. It was a most unpleasant case to go into, but one of enormous public importance. It was enormously important that it should be known to these young men, with whom the prisoner had come in contact, that there

was only one end to such a life as that of the prisoner Wilde, and that was at the hands of justice.

EVIDENCE FOR THE PROSECUTION

Charles Parker was called.

A young, slightly built, dark lad of respectable appearance stepped up, and Wilde, sitting now in the dock and partly hiding his face with his broad and heavily coated arm, looked up fiercely at him. Parker was fashionably dressed in a light grey over-coat with velvet cuffs.

The witness, being sworn, gave his age as nineteen years. He said he had been previously valet to a gentleman. He had a brother who had been a butler. About the end of March, 1893, he had been out of employment, but not absolutely without means. He had been out of employment only a week. He and his brother were together one evening at the St. James's Restaurant, when a man whom witness knew as Alfred Taylor spoke to them. He offered them drinks, and entered into conversation with them.

At this point Mr. Gill broke off his examination of the witness, and announced that he had just been informed that Alfred Taylor had been arrested. He proposed, he said, that that man should be charged and at once put in the dock beside Wilde, so that the evidence of the witnesses, instead of being repeated, could be heard by both at the same time.

The chief clerk directed that the charge should be formally entered, and a slight delay took place in the proceedings.

Mr. Humphreys asked how long it was proposed to sit that day.

Sir John Bridge :—As long as there are witnesses ready to be examined during the ordinary sitting of the court. It is a case that in the public interest is to be disposed of without delay. I will sit, if necessary, till four or five o'clock.

After about ten minutes a dark-complexioned, clean-shaved man, apparently about thirty years of age, with black hair brushed back from a high forehead, was put into the dock. Wilde received his fellow-prisoner with a bow, and Taylor smiled and bowed at him. Wilde, after rising to let Taylor pass to the other end of the dock, sat down again, whilst Taylor stood leaning forward and smiling sneeringly at the witness.

The short evidence given by Parker was read over and the examination continued.

Witness said that Taylor was the man who spoke to himself and his brother in the restaurant. The name of Mr. Wilde was mentioned by Taylor, who said he would like to introduce him to them.

Mr. Gill :—For what purpose?

Witness :—He said he was a good man.

But for what purpose?—He meant he was a good man for money.

Sir John Bridge :—But did he say why he wanted to introduce Wilde?

Witness :—Because he liked boys.

Mr. Gill :—After a time did you go to Little College Street, near the Houses of Parliament?—Not that evening.

No, but afterwards?—Yes. Taylor gave my brother the address. I went there with my brother. Taylor had three or four rooms: a drawing-room, a bedroom, and a kitchen. The drawing-room was very well furnished. The bedroom had a very low bed in it—not more than a foot or a foot-and-a-half from the ground. It was about eleven o'clock in the morning when we went there. I do not think the rooms were lit. They were swellish rooms.

Was anyone else there but Taylor?—No.

Well, what passed?—I forgot.

Here witness dropped his respectful manner of reply.

Mr. Gill:—Think, now; you got this address and went there by appointment, and you saw Taylor. What passed?—I forgot.

The Magistrate:—What was said?—He said he had arranged to introduce us to Mr. Wilde.

Where?—At a restaurant.

- What restaurant?—Kettner's or the Solferino.

The Magistrate:—What is Kettner's?

Mr. Gill:—They are both restaurants.

Mr. Gill:—What happened?—That evening, at half-past seven, was the time, and we went there with Taylor. Taylor made an appointment to meet us at the St. James's bar. He accompanied us to Kettner's, and we were shown into a private room where there was a table laid for four. The table was lighted with candles. Mr. Wilde came in, and we were introduced and dinner was served. We drank champagne; and after dinner coffee and brandy, and we all smoked cigarettes.

Did you see who paid for the dinner?—I saw Mr. Wilde write out a cheque.

Now, after dinner, did Wilde say anything to you? —Yes. He said, “This is the boy for me.” And then to me, “Will you come to the Savoy Hotel with me?” I said “Yes,” and we drove to the Savoy Hotel in a hansom. It was about ten o’clock. He took me to the second or third floor. I don’t know whether we entered a sitting-room. No one else was there. Whisky and soda for two was brought.

After the waiter who brought it had gone, what did Wilde say to you?—“Come into my bedroom.” There was a door leading to a bedroom from the sitting-room. Both of us went into the bedroom.

Witness gave details as to what was alleged to have occurred.

Mr. Gill:—I don’t propose to take this further, Sir John.

The Magistrate:—Misconduct took place?—Yes. I was there about two hours. He gave me £2 and told me to come again in about a week. I went. It was about eleven o’clock at night. I was shown to the same room—his sitting-room. I was alone with him after supper. We went into the bedroom afterwards, and I remained about an hour and a half. I then went away. He gave me £3 that time.

The Magistrate:—Did he say why he gave you £3 instead of £2?—Oh, he told me to buy some clothes. He also gave me a silver cigarette case and a gold chain ring.

Mr. Gill:—Did you see him again?—I saw him

again from time to time. He took me to the Crystal Palace, and on another occasion to the Pavilion, where we had a box, after which we went back to St. James's Street. I had a room at Park Walk, Chelsea, and he has visited me there. He kept his cab waiting. After that there was some unpleasantness with my landlady, and I left. Then I lived in Camera Square, which is about half an hour from Tite Street, but I cannot say if he visited me there. I visited him once at the Albemarle Hotel. I was taken there by—

Mr. Gill:—Never mind. I don't want to introduce any other name into this case.

Witness:—I last saw Mr. Wilde about nine months ago. He drove past me in Trafalgar Square and stopped the cab. He shook hands and said, "You are looking as pretty as ever." (The witness laughed at this.) I attended tea parties at Taylor's in Chapel Street. I was with Taylor when we were arrested in Fitzroy Square. After that incident I gave up all connection with people of this kind. I do not know Wood. I know Atkins, but not Mavor. I know Scarfe. I have dined with Mr. Wilde only at Kettner's and the Solferino. After I ceased companionship with these people I went into the country, where Mr. Charles Russell came to me for the other case.

At this point Mr. Travers Humphreys, barrister, who had appeared for Mr. Oscar Wilde at the Central Criminal Court in the Queensberry case arrived and had a conversation with his client as he passed behind the dock. Afterwards Mr. Humphreys announced that he intended to defend, but the charge had so

taken his client by surprise that he was not prepared to cross-examine Parker.

Charles Parker was then bound over in the sum of £80 to appear at the Sessions for the trial.

The court then adjourned for lunch.

EVIDENCE OF WILLIAM PARKER

On resuming,

William Parker, brother of the previous witness, being sworn, said :

I was formerly in employment as a groom. I and my brother in March, 1893, were out of employment, and on one occasion when we were together in the bar of the St. James's Restaurant a man accused us. I recognise Taylor as that man. He was a perfect stranger to us both.

Mr. Gill :—How did he introduce himself to you?—He was standing beside us for some time, and then he entered into conversation with us and asked us to have a drink.

Did he mention anyone's name?—He mentioned Mr. Oscar Wilde's name.

Counsel tried to get witness to say why Mr. Oscar Wilde's name was mentioned and for what purpose, but the witness said he could not remember any particular words used, though he understood the sense of what was said and the intention of the introduction. Pressed as to what the intention was, the witness said, “The same as women.” Later, on further questions being pressed, the witness became faint and unnerved and had to sit down.

Continuing his evidence, the witness said : Taylor got my name and address on this paper, which was in my handwriting, and said he should like to introduce us, as Oscar Wilde was a good man for money.

The Magistrate :—Money for those who were the same as women?—Yes.

The witness was then taken to the incident of the call at Taylor's rooms, the appointment for dinner the same night, and the introduction to Wilde, who made the request to Charles in his (witness's) presence, and the departure of the two. Witness said that he and Taylor afterwards left together, parting in Piccadilly. It was the only time he had met the prisoner Wilde.

Cross-examined by Mr. Travers Humphreys :—Can not you give us the date in March when the dinner took place?—No, I cannot.

The Magistrate :—When the prisoner Wilde and your brother went out, did they leave you behind?—Yes, sir.

Mr. Gill :—Taylor might like to ask a question.

Taylor :—No, I don't wish to say anything at present.

EVIDENCE OF MRS. ELLEN GRANT

Mrs. Ellen Grant, caretaker of the house at 13, Little College Street, Westminster, said that Taylor was tenant of rooms in her house from January, 1892—he was there on New Year's Day—till the last week in August, 1893. The rooms, she said, were very nicely furnished. Taylor did not let in the

daylight, but had art muslin strained across the windows, and then dark curtains and lace curtains of the ordinary kind. He kept no servant but used to do his own cooking.

Mr. Gill:—How was the place lighted?—By candles.

Who let people into the house?—If Mr. Taylor was dressed he did so himself.

Sir John Bridge, by a question, drew attention to the fact, which had been omitted, that the rooms were furnished by Taylor himself.

Witness went on to say that Taylor was visited by many gentlemen—many young ones of sixteen or seventeen years of age. Sometimes she opened the door to them. Taylor was very fond of scents and used to burn them. There was no woman staying with him. She understood that he was a bachelor, but she had seen women's things for fancy dress, such as shoes and stockings and a wig. She did not recognise the other prisoner as having been at the rooms.

Here, at the request of the magistrate, Wilde stood up, but the witness failed to identify him, and he sank back into his hard seat in the corner of the dock and spread out his arms, partially hiding his face, as he had done almost all through. The witness said further, in reply to questions, that sometimes young men stopped all night in the house. The names of several of those mentioned in the Queensberry case were put to the witness, and two or three, she said, were there for days at a time, sleeping with Taylor and sharing his room. There were tea parties at times,

but the visitors were always men. She had heard Taylor addressing one as "Oscar," and others as "Charlie dear," etc. Witness on one occasion allowed a gentleman who said he was a friend of Taylor to see the rooms, but witness afterwards learned that he was a police sergeant. Witness knew the house was being watched, and the police sergeant's visit was shortly before Taylor left. He left suddenly, telling her on the Saturday that he was going, and leaving on the Sunday. In January, 1893, a young man named Wood stayed there about three weeks. Witness had also seen a boy called Sidney Mavor, and one Charlie Mason, there.

The Magistrate:—Did Taylor ever tell you what he was?—I thought he was a gentleman.

When you heard him call someone Oscar, did you see the person he referred to?—No.*

EVIDENCE OF ALFRED WOOD

Alfred Wood, a tall, fair youth, about nineteen years of age, being sworn, said: I am a clerk. In January, 1893, I was staying with Taylor in his rooms. I was out of employment. Taylor had no occupation that I knew of. I know the other prisoner, Oscar Wilde. I think I made his acquaintance at the Café Royal. I think it was in January, 1893. We

* Two days later Messrs. Day, Russell and Co. stated through the Press that "Mrs. Grant, a witness in the Wilde case, has suffered considerable inconvenience through a statement which has appeared in some papers to the effect that she is the landlady of 13, Little College Street. Mrs. Grant is not in any way responsible for Mr. Taylor's presence in the house, she being merely a tenant of the lower portion of the house, and Taylor having a lease of the upper portion."

went to the Florence Restaurant in Rupert Street and had supper in a private room.

Mr. Gill:—A good supper?—Yes, a very nice supper with champagne and liqueurs. After that I went with him to Tite Street, to his house.

Where was his family?—He told me they were at Torquay. There seemed to be no one of the family in the house. He let us in with a key. We went to his bedroom and had drinks there.

The witness was asked by Mr. Gill in general terms if acts of impropriety took place, to which the witness said “Yes.” Then Mr. Humphreys objected to a leading question being put.

Sir John Bridge said it would not help the prisoner Wilde to have details, but as the objection was raised the witness would have to state the facts.

Evidence was then given, the witness excusing himself for what he alleged to have taken place by saying that he was the worse for drink at the time. Nevertheless, he admitted on further examination that he made subsequent visits to Tite Street, drink being always plentiful.

Asked by Sir John Bridge where the supper came from, the witness said that Mr. Wilde and himself went down to the pantry and found some. There was no servant seen by him at any time. Witness said he had seen Mr. Oscar Wilde at Taylor’s rooms in Little College Street. Witness had lodged in Langham Street, having a bedroom and sitting-room combined. Mr. Wilde called on him there one afternoon and stayed about twenty minutes, but witness did not remember anything taking place there. Mr. Wilde

gave him money on several occasions, said the witness — £3 and £4 at a time; he had also given him a watch and chain. The acquaintance ceased when witness left for America in March, 1893.

Mr. Gill:—How did your leaving come about?—I told Taylor that I would like to get away from these people.

Sir John Bridge:—Whom do you mean by “these people”?—Mr. Wilde and others.

Mr. Gill:—Let us leave others out at present. You had become acquainted with others who attended these tea parties at Taylor’s, and some of them are out of the country at present?—Yes.

You wanted to go abroad and told Taylor so?—Yes. I heard Taylor telling Mr. Wilde that I wanted to go to America, and Mr. Wilde asked me if I had any letters of his, and I said “Yes.” Taylor sent me a telegram to meet Mr. Wilde, and I went to his rooms, and he then gave me two £10 notes and two £5 notes.

Did you give him any letters then?—He asked me for them; he seemed very anxious to get them.

The Magistrate:—Did you give him letters of his that day?—Not his; other people’s.

Witness, continuing:—The next day I lunched with Mr. Wilde at the Florence. That was the last time I saw him. He sent me £5 by messenger after the lunch. I have been to the Savoy to see Mr. Wilde. I know Mavor.

Replying to Sir John Bridge, witness added that he first met Wilde at the Café Royal, having gone there in obedience to a telegram he received

from a gentleman whom he had met at Taylor's.

EVIDENCE OF SIDNEY MAVOR

Sidney Arthur Mavor, a tall youth, well dressed like each of the other youths who had been called, was the next witness, and, being sworn, said he made Taylor's acquaintance some time in 1892. He had visited Taylor at his rooms in Little College Street. He first met Mr. Oscar Wilde at Kettner's Restaurant. That was by appointment, and there was a dinner at which four were present, Lord Alfred Douglas and Taylor being the others. Witness did not know who paid for the dinner. That was in September, 1892. Mr. Wilde sent him a silver cigarette case about a week later. Witness said that he received a message later from Mr. Wilde to meet him.

Mr. Gill:—At an hotel?—I don't remember.

Come; we have the hotel books, you know.—I don't know the date; it might have been October. It was at the Albemarle Hotel. Mr. Wilde was waiting when I arrived, and I found that he had taken rooms, and a bedroom for me as well. My bedroom led from Mr. Wilde's bedroom.

Mr. Gill asked what took place, and the witness surprised Counsel by saying "Nothing."

Then, on being asked if he had not made a statement to Mr. Charles Russell, witness said "No." Mr. Russell had asked him a lot of questions, but witness did not think he had taken down his answers. Asked by the magistrate why he had stayed all

night, he said, "Because it was so late"; but afterwards admitted that he went with the intention of staying all night. Mr. Wilde paid the hotel bill. Witness also stated that he had stayed at Taylor's and had slept in the same bed about three times. Witness called Wilde "Oscar," and Wilde addressed witness as "Sidney."

EVIDENCE OF ANTONIO MIGGE

Antonio Migge described himself as a professor of massage. Counsel wounded the prisoner's *amour propre* by asserting that he was employed at the Savoy Hotel, a suggestion which he repudiated. He attended there to massage patients. He had attended to massage Mr. Oscar Wilde at the hotel, a bedroom on the third floor being occupied by him. It was in March, 1893, from the 16th to the 20th of the month. One morning on going to the room, he entered after knocking, and there saw a young man in the bed. At first he thought it was a young lady, as he saw only the head. It was someone about sixteen or eighteen years of age. Mr. Wilde was in the same room dressing himself. He told witness that he felt so much better that morning, and that as he was very busy he could not stay to have the treatment. Witness never attended Mr. Wilde again.

EVIDENCE OF JANE COTTER

Jane Cotter, chambermaid at the Savoy Hotel, spoke to Wilde occupying a bedroom and a sitting-

room at the hotel, and to her discovery of a boy occupying the same bed.

REMAND OF THE ACCUSED

Mr. Gill then said that that was as far as he proposed to go that day; and after a consultation the accused were ordered to be remanded till the following Thursday at eleven o'clock.

Mr. Travers Humphreys asked for bail, saying that sureties could be offered to any amount, and he remarked that though all day on the Friday previously it was known to Mr. Wilde that a warrant might be issued for his arrest, yet he made no attempt or effort to get away.

Mr. Gill said the charges were relied on by the defence in the other case. He opposed bail.

Sir John Bridge said he could not grant bail. Mr. Wilde could be seen at Holloway by his solicitor during his remand.

Mr. Humphreys :—Sureties to any amount can be offered.

Sir John Bridge :—There will be no bail under any conditions, but I may be able to consider the matter further next Thursday.

Wilde sighed heavily as he heard the decision; and after a short consultation with his Counsel, he slowly raised himself and followed his fellow-prisoner out of the dock and through the prisoners' door. It was expected that the accused would be afforded the privilege of a cab to Holloway, but, no one appearing

to supply the money for it, Wilde and Taylor went away in the ordinary police van.

Immediately on the conclusion of the hearing before Sir John Bridge, Wilde was conducted to one of the cells below, where by permission of the magistrate he was seen by several of his friends. The conversation turned on the question of the defence, and it was understood that Mr. Mathews and Mr. H. Avory would be entrusted with the conduct of the defence during the magisterial proceedings.

viii.—THE SECOND DAY AT BOW STREET

Thursday, April 11th, was the second day of the hearing at Bow Street before Sir John Bridge of the charges brought against Oscar Wilde and Alfred Taylor.

There was again a large crowd of people anxious to gain admission to the court, and a scramble for places occurred. The accused were brought from Holloway Prison, where they had been on remand since the previous Saturday. The police van was received by the motley crowd of roughs, hanging about the entrance to the court, with a hoarse shout which might have been a cheer or a jeer. The van was driven rapidly into the station yard, the gates closed to behind it, and that was all the public saw of the day's proceedings. Wilde was taken from the van and locked up in one of the cells reserved for prisoners in waiting; and Taylor was locked up in a similar cell. Shortly before half-past ten Warder Bush went to Wilde's cell and asked him to follow him. He was then brought into the now crowded court. Taylor, in charge of a police constable, followed a few moments later, and was placed in the dock beside Wilde.

In Counsels' seats were Sir Edward Clarke, Q.C., M.P., accompanied by Mr. Travers Humphreys, his junior; Mr. Arthur Newton, freshly instructed, sat at the solicitors' table, holding in his hand a brief for the accused Taylor.

Mr. C. F. Gill, who (instructed by Mr. Angus Lewis) conducted the case for the prosecution, arrived later. The Hon. H. Cuffe, of the Treasury, was also in attendance.

Wilde's face had undergone a distinct change since his appearance on the previous Saturday. It was evident that his confinement was telling upon him. It may be mentioned that the charge against Wilde was a "misdemeanour" and not a "felony." It was, therefore, within the discretion of the magistrate to refuse bail while the accused was still on remand. The balance of legal opinion, however, is in favour of the proposition that a person committed for trial on a misdemeanour is entitled to bail as of right; and if the magistrate refuses the accused can appeal to a judge in chambers. It will be noticed that from the moment of his arrest Wilde was treated as guilty by almost everybody, especially by the lower class Press, which did its best to stir up prejudice against him. It is stated that he was all the time treated more harshly than an ordinary prisoner would have been.

Wilde seemed paler and thinner. He entered the dock with a languid and wearied air, and having seated himself at one end leaned heavily upon his right elbow. He was wearing a grey overcoat with velvet collar and cuffs.

It was not until five minutes past eleven that Sir John Bridge, the magistrate, took his seat on the bench.

Directly the magistrate had taken his seat, Sir Edward Clarke rose and said:
I appear in this case with my friend Mr. Travers

Humphreys for the defence of Mr. Oscar Wilde. I have had the opportunity of reading the depositions which were taken last Saturday, and I am much obliged for the permission to postpone the cross-examination of those witnesses. But upon consideration I have decided not to ask for those witnesses to be recalled for cross-examination, as probably no cross-examination could effect the result as far as this court is concerned, and so far as your action in the matter is concerned. And of course it is desirable on all grounds that the investigation shall be taken in as short a time as possible, and with as few occasions for hearing as possible in this court. And, saying that with regard to the witnesses who have been called, I shall probably take the same course with regard to other witnesses, with a view to shorten the proceedings before you.

Sir John Bridge agreed that the course proposed by the learned Counsel was highly desirable.

Mr. Arthur Newton pointed out that his client, Mr. Alfred Taylor, who was charged only with conspiring with Mr. Wilde, stood upon a rather different footing, which made it desirable to cross-examine some of the witnesses on his behalf.

CROSS-EXAMINATION OF CHARLES PARKER

The lad Charles Parker was first recalled. He was respectably dressed in apparently new clothes, purchased, it was rumoured, with the money provided by those who were most anxious for a conviction in the case. He was cross-examined by Mr. Arthur

Newton on behalf of Taylor. He began by correcting his age. He was twenty-one, he admitted; not nineteen. He denied that he was introduced to Taylor by a man named Harrington, and he adhered to his statement that he was accosted by Taylor first in a restaurant. He recognised, he said, the peril of prosecution in which he himself stood, but he denied, with an air very like that of honest indignation, that he had been guilty of improprieties before he met Mr. Wilde. He declared that he knew nothing of its being Taylor's birthday on that occasion when he was first taken to dine with Mr. Wilde. He knew the man Atkins who was mentioned at the Old Bailey in connection with the blackmailing letters, but he knew him only as a comedian and not as a notorious black-mailer who lived by accusations against gentlemen. He left his own employment as valet because the gentleman could not afford to keep him. He was afterwards accused of stealing his master's clothes. He never stole a sovereign from Taylor, though he knew Taylor thought he did. He never paid it back by instalments, but could not say whether his brother ever did. He was arrested in the Fitzroy Square raid the previous year, but he declared he knew only one other man concerned in that little adventure. That man was Taylor. Taylor, however, had had nothing to do with witness's visit to the Savoy.

Mr. Newton:—When was it you first made a statement which was taken down in writing?—About a month ago, to Mr. Charles Russell.

Parker was very fidgety under cross-examination, and kept nervously kicking the front of the witness-

box. Then Mr Newton touched a more serious point.

Mr. Newton :—Just before your arrest did you not get £30 in conjunction with two other persons by threatening to accuse a gentleman of a crime?—I didn't; the others gave it to me.

They had extorted it from a gentleman?—I think that is right.

By threatening to accuse him of a crime?—I don't know whether that was the way they got it.

They extorted more than the £30?—I think so.

That was your share?—Yes.

Had you been guilty of impropriety with that gentleman?—Yes.

Then it was hush money?—I don't know that.

Sir John Bridge :—Isn't that substantially what it was?—I don't know what they gave it to me for. They didn't tell me to keep my mouth shut. They only told me who it came from.

Re-examined by Mr. Gill, the witness stated that from the time he made Taylor's acquaintance until their arrest in Fitzroy Street he saw Taylor frequently.

Parker seemed relieved when the final question was reached. This was an inquiry as to his meeting with Taylor. Taylor asked him if he would like to know Mr. Wilde, and Parker said, "Yes, I should."

The other witnesses who were called on the previous hearing of the case were not now present and therefore could not be cross-examined.

EVIDENCE OF FREDERICK ATKINS

Mr. Gill therefore passed on to Frederick Atkins, a pale-eyed, pimply-faced youth of twenty. He was

dressed in a green cord waistcoat with blue spots, a blue Oxford shirt, and a jacket of rough brown tweed.

Frederick Atkins, being sworn, and examined by Mr. Gill for the prosecution, said he was twenty years of age. He knew the prisoner Taylor and the establishment at 13, Little College Street. Taylor introduced him to Wilde in November, 1893, when all three and another man, one of the gentlemen referred to but not mentioned by name in the Old Bailey proceedings, dined together at the Florence Restaurant in Soho. Mr. Wilde asked witness if he would like to go to Paris with him as his private secretary. He said "Yes," and they went two days later by the Club train from Victoria. Arrived in Paris they went to 29, Boulevard des Capucines, a private hotel, where Mr. Wilde had a bed-sitting-room and witness a bedroom. The two rooms communicated. Next day they lunched at the Café Julien, and in the afternoon went to the Grand Hotel to have their hair cut. Mr. Wilde spoke in French to the barber, who began to curl witness's hair, and he forbade him. They dined together—"the best dinner I ever had in my life," said the witness—and afterwards Mr. Wilde gave him a louis and told him to go out and amuse himself.

Mr. Gill:—To go to the Moulin Rouge?—No; he told me not to go there, but I went.

Witness then said that he returned at half-past two in the morning, and declared that he found a third person in bed with Wilde.

"That was Schwabe," added the witness in a low, hesitating tone.

"Leave that for a moment," said Mr. Gill hurriedly.

At half-past nine next morning, continued the witness, Mr. Wilde came and sat on the edge of witness's bed and talked to him about women, warning him that they were the ruin of young men. "He told me not to have anything to do with them." Witness gave no evidence of any impropriety. When they arrived at Victoria on their return, Mr. Wilde gave him £3 and a silver cigarette case. The latter, witness produced. It was an ordinary one with curved sides.

Mr. Gill reverted to the dinner at the Florence, and the witness mentioned that he "thought it was funny" that Mr. Wilde kissed the waiter and put his arms round witness's neck.

"He had his arms round Douglas's neck, too," added Atkins.

"Ah, leave that," interposed Mr. Gill.

Mr. Newton, in cross-examination:—Don't mention any names, but were you not introduced to Mr. Taylor by the gentleman who was in Paris?—Yes.

Did not that gentleman also introduce you to Mr. Wilde?—No.

The witness further denied that he had been living for years past with a man named Burton,* or that he

* The man Burton was a notorious blackmailer who kept a gang of youths of the Parker and Atkins type. These young miscreants would go out and persuade men to go home with them.* Burton would then turn up and demand money from the victim. He was known as "Uncle Burton," and the youths as his "nephews." Burton is stated to have been "in" with the police. Certainly the prosecution in this case must have known the sort of man he was.

had extorted money from a gentleman. He declared that he was then, as he was when he first met Taylor, a comedian and a bookmaker's clerk. He was not in the habit of extorting money from persons by threatening to accuse them of serious crimes.

Sir John Bridge :—Did you do any secretarial work for Mr. Wilde in Paris?—Yes; I wrote something about the “Woman of No Importance.” It took me about half an hour.

At this point Sir Edward Clarke left the case in the hands of Mr. Travers Humphreys.

EVIDENCE OF EDWARD SHELLEY

The next witness was a tall, heavy-framed young fellow with a square jaw and a distinctly “intellectual” face (as Wilde had said of him at the Old Bailey). This was Edward Shelley, the young clerk who was employed by Messrs. Elkin Mathews and John Lane at the Bodley Head, where he made Mr. Wilde's acquaintance. In spite of the stifling close ness of the court he wore a heavy double-breasted overcoat tightly buttoned.

Edward Shelley,* being sworn, was examined by Mr. Gill. He deposed that he was formerly in the employ of Messrs. Elkin Mathews and John Lane, a firm of publishers, of the Bodley Head, Vigo Street, W., who were about to publish a volume of Mr.

* Shelley received a wage of 15/- a week. It is stated that he was paid over £20 for his two days' attendance at the Old Bailey during the libel action against Lord Queensberry, though he was not then called upon to go into the witness-box.

Wilde's poems. Witness made Mr. Wilde's acquaintance at the end of 1891, over the retail book counter. Mr. Wilde was at the Bodley Head about the publication of one of his books. The acquaintance was encouraged by presents of Mr. Wilde's works from the author to witness. An invitation to dine at the Albemarle followed in February. The witness took so much wine that he became excited. After dining in a private room they had more to drink; and witness alleged that Wilde said to him, "Will you come into my room?" Witness continued: "I didn't know what the man was. I only thought he was going to put me up for the night. I admired his works, and he always professed to be fond of me and flattered me. He said I was clever." Some time in 1893 he wrote a letter to Mr. Wilde expressing a wish never to see him again.

Wilde listened to this witness's evidence with an inscrutable countenance, his gloves hanging from his fingers while his hands supported and almost covered his face. His eyes remained fixed blankly on the wall behind the magistrate.

Continuing his evidence, in answer to questions from the prosecuting Counsel, Shelley went on to describe visits to Kettner's, the Café Royal, the Independent Theatre, and other places in company with Mr. Wilde. He said he had destroyed all the letters he had received from Wilde, and had torn out the inscribed title-page from each book which had been given to him. He had kept the books, however, including a copy of "A House of Pomegranates," "a book," added witness, "not fit for children to

read."* Wilde had asked him to go to Paris with him, but witness had been unable to get away.

Mr. Arthur Newton, cross-examining on behalf of Taylor:—Taylor is a stranger to you?—Quite a stranger.

Shelley then left the witness-box.

EVIDENCE OF MRS. LUCY RUMSBY

Mrs. Lucy Rumsby, a stout old lady in a plush mantle and a crêpe bonnet, being sworn and examined, said she was the landlady of the house at 50, Park Walk, Chelsea, where for a fortnight Charles Parker had occupied a small room. At the end of that time she gave him notice to leave in consequence of a complaint made by another lodger. She had seen Parker call at a house in Chapel Street, which was close by.

EVIDENCE OF MRS. MARGERY BANCROFT

Mrs. Margery Bancroft, who lived in the same house, said that Taylor, who at that time was living at No. 3, Chapel Street, which was just round the corner, sometimes called for Parker. On one occasion, late at night, a cab drew up at the door, and she saw Parker and Mr. Wilde alight.

Both defendants were ordered to stand up, and the

* "In building this *House of Pomegranates*, I had about as much intention of pleasing the British child as I had of pleasing the British public."—Oscar Wilde, *Pall Mall Gazette*, December 11, 1891.

witness stated positively that she recognised them both.

Taylor smiled, but Wilde remained impassive and superior.

Mrs. Bancroft added further that she had her suspicions, and that it was on her complaint that Parker was sent away. Park Walk was some ten minutes from Tite Street, but Mr. Wilde came in a cab.

EVIDENCE OF MRS. SOPHIA GRAY

Mrs. Sophia Gray, the landlady of 3, Chapel Street, gave similar evidence. She let two rooms to Taylor from August to the end of 1893. She had seen Parker there, and also Mr. Oscar Wilde. Parker had stayed all night. When Taylor went away he left behind a box of papers which the witness had handed over to Mr. Russell, Lord Queensberry's solicitor. Taylor never seemed to have any occupation, and had not many callers. Perhaps two or three young men had called at different times. She knew nothing about the Little College Street establishment.

Cross-examined by Mr. Newton:—You are not in the habit of asking questions about your lodgers' business?—Oh, no. I knew he was a man of respectable family. He always acted as a gentleman in my place.

Mr. Gill:—You never saw any ladies there?—Oh, no, sir.

The court adjourned for lunch.

EVIDENCE OF SERVANTS AND OTHERS

Mary Applegate, servant in the house where the

witness Atkins lodged, identified Wilde as a visitor to Atkins. There was, she added, a picture of Mr. Wilde hanging on the walls in Atkins's room. Mr. Wilde had taken tea with Atkins on two occasions. On one of those occasions there was another young man present. The young man's name was Barford.

Thomas Price, waiter from the private hotel in St. James's Place, where Wilde had rooms from October, 1893, to April, 1894, spoke of the many young men visitors Wilde had. Among them were——

Mr. Gill:—Ha! Never mind names just now. Was Charles Parker among them?—Yes.

Taylor?—Yes; once.

Atkins?—Yes; several times; two or three.

A boy named Scarfe?—Yes; several times.

A lad named Barford?—Yes.

What were the names which Mr. Gill did not wish to be mentioned, after suggesting this list, was a point which raised considerable curiosity.

Aloys Louis Vogel, proprietor of the Albemarle Hotel, was examined as to certain dates in 1892 and 1893 upon which Mr. Wilde had visited or stayed at the hotel. It was Mr. Wilde's habit, said the witness, to finish his plays at the Albemarle, and to produce them from there. Many young men called upon him, and at first it was thought that they came from theatres. But something raised suspicions, and after the third visit witness came to the conclusion that Mr. Wilde should not come to his hotel again. Witness through his solicitors pressed Mr. Wilde for a small outstanding bill, thinking that by so doing he would

prevent his return. Witness went abroad for his health, and on returning found to his great annoyance that Mr. Wilde was at the Albemarle from the 1st to the 17th of January of that year. To prevent him coming there again witness issued a writ for the payment of a week's bill.

Mrs. Annie Perkins, living at Southsea, formerly housekeeper at the Savoy Hotel, deposed to certain incidents occurring during the time Mr. Wilde was staying at the hotel.

Mr. Elkin Mathews, publisher, of Vigo Street, formerly partner with Mr. John Lane at the Bodley Head, said that while he was with Mr. Lane the youth Shelley was in the firm's employ. They were acting as publishers for Mr. Wilde, and he occasionally came to the office. Witness saw that Mr. Wilde was writing to Shelley, and Shelley was requested to leave the firm's employ.

Police-Inspector Charles Richards said that on April 5th he went with Sergeant Allen to the Cadogan Hotel, Sloane Street, and saw the prisoner Wilde there. Witness said to Wilde, "We are police officers." He said, "Yes?" and on being told that they held a warrant for his arrest he asked "Where shall I be taken to?" Witness said, "You will have to go to Scotland Yard with me and then to Bow Street." He said, "Can I have bail?" Witness replied, "I don't think you can." Witness then conveyed Mr. Wilde to Scotland Yard. On the next day witness went to 25, Denbigh Place, Pimlico, where the prisoner Taylor was living. Taylor was not there; but several things of a peculiar nature were, among

which was a gold brooch that Taylor had used to fasten his night-shirt. He also found seven or eight pairs of trousers.

Inspector Thomas Brockwell said that at five o'clock on April 5th he received a warrant granted by Sir John Bridge for the arrest of Mr. Oscar Wilde. While witness was at Scotland Yard, Wilde was brought in by Inspector Richards and Sergeant Allen. When the warrant was read over to him, Wilde put out his hand and asked to be allowed to read it. This he was not permitted to do. Wilde then said, "What are the mentioned dates?" Witness replied, "On the 20th of March, 1893, and divers other days." Wilde made no further reply. Some letters, memoranda, and three writs were found upon him; also an envelope addressed to Sidney Mavor, Esq., with a pencilled note enclosed, in the following words:

DEAR SID,—Could not wait any longer. Come on at once and see Oscar. He is at Tite Street. I am there.
Yours, ALF. TAYLOR.

A note from Taylor to Wilde read:

DEAR OSCAR,—When I left home yesterday I left a note for Sidney Mavor. Littlechild called shortly afterwards and saying he wished to write a note got into my room. I found on getting back that the note to Mavor had been opened. In its place was one from Littlechild saying that he wished to see me next morning.

When Taylor was arrested he seemed surprised, but not at the arrest. "Is that all?" he asked on hearing the charge; and to Detective Harris, when that officer tapped him on the shoulder, he said smilingly, "Oh,

I expected you last night." Harris was an old acquaintance of Taylor. He watched Taylor in 1893, got into the man's rooms, and described how they were heavily scented and draped all over, ceiling and all. He was afterwards instructed to watch Taylor's rooms at Denbigh Place. On April 6th he saw Taylor there, and arrested him.

In reply to Mr. Newton, the witness said that he did not know whether Taylor was at the Old Bailey every day during the trial of the action against Lord Queensberry.

Inspector Brockwell, recalled for the prosecution, stated that on Wilde he found after his arrest twenty £5 notes and a cheque book on the Westminster branch of the London and Westminster Bank. He produced them there that day.

The writs found on Wilde were for money owing for jewellery and cigarette cases and other things.

Alfred Wood, recalled, identified a letter he wrote from America to Taylor, in which he said, "Tell Oscar he can send me a draft for an Easter egg." Taylor did not answer the letter.

Witness had never received the cheque for five shillings from Taylor which was produced, though it was true it was made out in his name. He had borrowed five shillings from Taylor, but had repaid it.

Burton, whose name was mentioned in the letter, was not, he believed, known to Taylor. The first time he met Wilde, at the restaurant in Regent Street, witness was alone.

George Frederick Claridge, employed by Messrs. Thornhill, Walter and Co., of 144, New Bond Street,

W., jewellers, then gave evidence as to selling and engraving a cigarette case. The inscription ordered was "Sidney from O.W.," and instructions were given by Mr. Wilde for it to be sent to S. A. Mavor, Esq., at an address he gave.

The accused were then remanded until the next week. It was understood that the case would conclude, as far as the police court proceedings were concerned, on that day.

Mr. Travers Humphreys again applied for bail for Mr. Oscar Wilde, but it was refused.

Mr. Arthur Newton applied on behalf of Taylor, who was said to be a member of a highly respectable family, some members of whom were willing to give substantial security.

Sir John Bridge declared that the case was not one for bail at all. "In a case of this kind," the magistrate added, "a man's respectable connections are not in any way a reason to let him out on bail—rather the contrary."

The further hearing of the case was then adjourned for eight days.

Among the people of some importance in the crowded court during the day were Sir Augustus Harris and Mr. Jerome K. Jerome. The latter had been the first to draw public attention, in his weekly periodical, "To-day," to the publication of "The Chameleon." He demanded its withdrawal from circulation. It is possible that Wilde had given offence to Mr. Jerome previously, as he is reported to have said that the author of "Three Men in a Boat" was "vulgar without being funny."

ix.—COMMITTED FOR TRIAL

A sensational but unfounded rumour that other arrests had been made in connection with the charges against Oscar Wilde and Alfred Taylor brought another large crowd to Bow Street, where the accused were charged before Sir John Bridge for the third time on Friday morning, April 19th.

Mr. C. F. Gill, instructed by Mr. Angus Lewis and Mr. F. G. Frayling, of the Treasury, prosecuted. Mr. Travers Humphreys appeared for Wilde, and Mr. Arthur Newton for Taylor.

It had been obvious from the first that the Treasury had been anxious to avoid overloading the case against the accused, rather than press the charge, which remained one of misdemeanour. If the accused should be committed to take their trial on the charges as they then stood, it was thought that the magistrate would be bound to admit to bail, though he would have practically unlimited discretion as to the amount of the recognisances. Had the defendants been charged with actual felony, it was to be expected that they would be kept in custody until the time of the trial. The next Old Bailey Sessions were to begin on the following Monday.

Owing to some misunderstanding the day's proceedings did not begin till noon, though witnesses and

a large crowd of would-be auditors were in attendance by ten o'clock.

Mr. C. F. Gill had promised the previous week to complete the case for the prosecution very briefly at this hearing, and so the duration of it would depend on the course taken on behalf of the defendants. Sir Edward Clarke determined to reserve cross-examination on behalf of Wilde, and not to call any witnesses in that court. Mr. Newton, however, who represented Taylor, addressed the court with a view to showing that no case had been made out on which his client could properly be committed.

When the prison van from Holloway drove into the station yard at Bow Street there was again a little booing of an inarticulate kind. The crowd appeared to have no clear opinion of the prisoners one way or another, but knew only that it was disappointed at not being able to see them nor get into the court.

The officials at Bow Street Police Court, to the limited extent of the accommodation at their command, always make admirable arrangements both for the Press and the public at the hearing of a *cause célèbre*. But the Extradition Court, where this case was taken, is small and the number of the curious is unlimited, especially when the case is of a kind in which a good deal of the corroborative evidence cannot be fully printed.

Mr. J. P. Grain was now present to watch the case on behalf of Mr. Sidney Mavor, whose examination by the prosecution at the previous hearing had failed to produce anything of an incriminating nature against either of the accused.

Mavor was a tall young fellow, clean shaven, with perhaps a slight cast in his eye. He was said to have ambitions for the music-hall stage. He appeared in court dressed in the height of fashion, with immaculate black frockcoat, brilliant silk hat, and a very deep collar.

It was ten minutes past twelve before Mr. C. F. Gill arrived; and at twenty minutes past the magistrate and Sir Edward Clarke were still missing. In another minute or two, however, Sir John Bridge took his seat and the accused were brought into court. Wilde came first, and strode into the dock, followed by Taylor smiling. Wilde had changed in a startling degree. His face was haggard and grey, his cheeks seemed fallen in, his hair unkempt, and his general mien was one of great depression and sudden age. Even his clothes—the grey coat with the velvet collar and cuffs, the silk hat, the gloves—seemed to have deteriorated. Taylor, on the other hand, appeared dapper and apparently careless even when the first witness alleged the most damaging statements about him.

On the application of Mr. Newton, the defendants were allowed to be seated, and the privilege seemed very welcome to Wilde, who sank heavily into the corner of the seat and let his head fall on his hand. In the absence of Sir Edward Clarke his interests were watched by Mr. Travers Humphreys.

•

CHARLES PARKER RECALLED

The witness Charles Parker, whose evidence was taken at the last hearing, was recalled, and Mr. Gill

put to him a series of questions which elicited evidence against Taylor of a more serious character than anything hitherto actually heard in the case.

Taylor laughed contemptuously at some of the witness's statements, but his colour heightened and for the first time he betrayed something like uneasiness. Parker told also of a more fantastic episode in which Taylor and a lad named Charlie Mason went through a mock ceremony of marriage. Taylor, witness alleged, wore female garments, Mason played the bridegroom, and the ceremony was followed by a wedding breakfast. Witness lived for a fortnight with Taylor at 3, Chapel Street. While there, and previously while at 13, Little College Street, Taylor made certain suggestions to him which he declined to agree to.

Parker seemed to grow more confident when told he would not be detained long in the witness-box, and he grinned significantly when answering certain questions.

William Parker, brother of the last witness, also gave evidence. This lad, first asking, "Am I to speak plainly?" spoke very plainly indeed.

Taylor sneered and affected to smile at witness's statements, but he presently placed his face on his gloved hands on the front of the dock and kept his eyes cast on the floor.

EVIDENCE OF A DETECTIVE AND OTHERS

Frederick Kearley, a superannuated detective-inspector of the Metropolitan Police, was the next witness. Being sworn, in answer to questions put to

him by Mr. Gill, he deposed that he was employed by Messrs, Day and Russell, Lord Queensberry's solicitors, to make the inquiries on which his lordship's justification of the libel on Mr. Oscar Wilde was based. In the course of those inquiries he obtained from Mrs. Gray, the landlady of 3, Chapel Street, where Taylor was living, a leather hat-box containing papers. Among these were letters and short notes making appointments for meetings between Wilde, Taylor and Mavor. There were also cheques for 30s. and £2 drawn in favour of S. Mavor, and a telegram asking Taylor to meet Mr. Wilde at the Savoy.

Among the telegrams read was one sent from Goring, near Reading, on August 21st, 1893, to Taylor, " Cannot manage dinner to-morrow. So sorry. Oscar." Another one, dispatched from Knightsbridge, was : " Obliged to see Tree at five o'clock, so don't come to Savoy. Let me know at once about Fred.—Oscar."

Formal evidence of Wilde's occupation of particular rooms at the Savoy Hotel in March, 1893, was given by Charles Robinson, a bookkeeper at the hotel. Those rooms were Nos. 361 and 362, and afterwards Nos. 343 and 346.

A certified copy of the account of " Alfred Waterhouse Somerset Taylor " at the Marylebone branch of the Westminster Bank from January 1st, 1892, to December 29, 1893, was produced by Theodore Leith, a clerk.

Reginald Brooks, of the Westminster branch of the same bank, produced a copy of Mr. Oscar Wilde's banking account from January 1st, 1892, to April 9th,

1895, but the significance of the evidence did not transpire.

Transcript of the evidence taken by shorthand writers, William Lehmann and Ebenezer Howard, at the trial of Lord Queensberry at the Old Bailey was also put in. This seemed to portend possible charges of perjury.

The cross-examination of these witnesses was merely perfunctory and did not attempt to controvert their statements.

CLOSE OF THE PROSECUTION

Mr. Gill said that the case for the prosecution was now complete. He had extracted from the depositions the offences on which he would ask Sir John Bridge to commit the prisoners to take their trial.

These Mr. Gill handed up to the magistrate, who carefully examined them. Wilde meanwhile stroked his head or bit the nail of his little finger and seemed impassive and to all appearances indifferent; but Taylor began to show signs of apparent great uneasiness.

Sir John Bridge suggested that the proposed indictment had better be read out, and Mr. Travers Humphreys said he should like to know what charges his client had to answer.

Mr. John Alexander, the chief clerk, then read aloud the charges, which in a cloud of legal verbiage alleged that Wilde and Taylor had conspired together to procure the commission of certain acts by Wilde with the persons who were

therein named; and finally and most seriously that Taylor attempted to commit an "abominable crime." This last charge was based on the evidence given that morning by the witnesses Charles and William Parker.

Sir John Bridge:—Now you have heard the offences of which you stand charged and the evidence given against you. Do you wish to say anything in answer to the charge? You are not obliged to say anything, and whatever you do say will be taken down in writing and may be used in evidence against you at your trial. Do you wish to say anything, Wilde?

Wilde, standing up, quietly answered: No, not at present, your worship.

There was not a trace of emotion, and the cultured voice was under perfect control.

Sir John Bridge:—Do you wish to say anything, Taylor?

Mr. Arthur Newton, on behalf of Alfred Taylor:—

Before my client answers the question will you allow me, Sir John, to take your ruling upon the question as to whether there is any evidence to meet the graver charge? I hope before you commit Taylor you will come to the conclusion that the only evidence given against him came from two discredited persons.

The Magistrate:—There is general corroboration of the nature of Taylor's life which makes the evidence of the Parkers admissible.

I respectfully submit, Sir John, that there is no corroboration as to particular offences.

Not on particular dates, but generally.

Considering the nature of the alleged crimes, and

that they are alleged to have been committed about three years ago, I do submit that there is not a case to go to the Central Criminal Court so far as the more serious accusation named at the end of the charge against Taylor is concerned.

That does not alter the case at all. A crime is always a crime. Certainly I shall commit. The prisoners are committed for trial.

APPLICATION FOR BAIL

Mr. Travers Humphreys applied that Mr. Oscar Wilde might now be admitted to bail. He based the application chiefly on the importance to the defendant of being at complete liberty to direct personally the preparation of his defence, and in offering sureties to any amount his worship might demand, Mr. Humphreys reminded the magistrate that after all the only charge against Mr. Wilde was one of misdemeanour.

“ You can understand,” continued Counsel, “ that there are witnesses to be obtained for the defence, and it is very difficult for Mr. Wilde to communicate with persons and prepare his defence unless he is to have the facilities of a man at liberty. I think that the case is really one for bail.”

Mr. Arthur Newton, in making a similar application on behalf of Alfred Taylor, urged that his client had shown no desire to evade arrest, but had been available at any moment during the trial of Lord Queensberry at the Old Bailey, after which he returned quietly to his own home, where the police found him.

The Magistrate: In deciding what to do with a case of this kind I have to use my discretion according (in the words of a great judge) to the evidence given and the gravity of the accusation. With regard to the gravity of the case, I think there is no worse crime than that with which the prisoners are charged. As to the evidence, all I shall say is that I do not think it is slight, and I shall therefore refuse bail.

The accused showed little or no disappointment at the magistrate's decision, which could hardly have surprised them considering the attitude of the Press and the vast majority of the public against the more distinguished of the two prisoners. They were immediately removed to the cells, and later in the afternoon were taken back in the prison van to Holloway.

It was thought possible at the time that an application might be made to the Court of Queen's Bench to admit Wilde to bail on the ground that the magistrate had acted *ultra vires* in declining to accept substantial recognisances in a case of misdemeanour. But the law moves notoriously slowly, and it is probable that if application had been made to a higher court no decision would have been arrived at before the beginning of the Sessions at the Central Criminal Court on the following Monday, at which Sessions the accused were to take their trial. There is, however, no doubt but that Wilde would have been much more fitted, mentally and physically, to prepare his defence and to meet the charges brought against him if he had been at liberty. The truly extraordinary remark of Sir John Bridge that to his mind there was no offence so

serious as the misdemeanour with which Wilde was charged would seem to display a gross ignorance of the history of the world from the earliest days of civilisation, and also a narrow-minded bigotry worthy of Mrs. Grundy, Exeter Hall, or a halfpenny news sheet. Moreover, one would have thought that rape, robbery with violence, and wilful murder were much more serious than that which has been described as "at the most, a reprehensible sexual error." Clearly the law of the land thinks the same by discriminating between a misdemeanour and a felony, but the gentleman paid and appointed to carry out the law thought differently.

- On Tuesday, April 23rd, the Grand Jury found true bills in the case of Oscar Fingall O'Flahertie Wills Wilde and Alfred Waterhouse Somerset Taylor on the various counts in the indictment.

On the same day the Press Association was informed by Messrs. Humphreys, solicitors to Mr. Oscar Wilde, that their client would plead not guilty. They said that their intention was to fight the case to the end, and they expressed themselves as confident of winning when the trial came on at the Old Bailey.

APPLICATION FOR POSTPONEMENT OF THE TRIAL

At the Central Criminal Court on Wednesday, April 24th, before Mr. Justice Charles, Mr. Charles Willie Mathews asked that the trial of Mr. Oscar Wilde might be postponed until the May Sessions. The application was made on the grounds set out in

an affidavit which the learned Counsel handed to his lordship, namely, that the defence had not had proper time to prepare their case; and further, that in the state of popular feeling existing at the time Mr. Wilde would not get a fair and impartial trial.

Mr. John Peter Grain, on behalf of Mr. Alfred Taylor, said that his client was desirous of having the charges against him brought to an issue as early as possible.

Mr. Charles Frederick Gill, for the prosecution, opposed the application for the postponement of the trial. Under ordinary circumstances, the difficulties mentioned by his friend Mr. Mathews would be reasonable grounds for such application; but he submitted that they were not reasonable in that instance. The fullest possible information had been given to Mr. Wilde as to the charges he would have to meet. Counsel asked that the application be not granted.

Mr. Justice Charles said that he did not feel justified, on the material contained in the affidavit, in acceding to the application. As to the defendants not having a fair trial, his lordship thought that any suggestion such as that was groundless.

The defendants were not present in court during the application.

x.—THE TRIAL OF OSCAR WILDE AND ALFRED TAYLOR AT THE OLD BAILEY

Proceedings on the Queen's Commission of Oyer and Terminer and Gaol Delivery for the City of London, and Gaol Delivery for the County of Middlesex and the parts of the Counties of Essex, Kent, and Surrey, within the jurisdiction of the Central Criminal Court, held on Monday, April 22nd, 1895, and following days, before the Right Hon. Sir Joseph Renals, Knt., Lord Mayor of the City of London; the Hon. Sir Arthur Charles, Knt., one of the Justices of Her Majesty's High Court of Justice; Sir James Clarke Lawrence, Bart., Sir Reginald Hanson, Bart., Sir David Evans, K.C.M.G., Sir Stuart Knill, Bart., Aldermen of the said City; Sir Charles Hall, Q.C., M.P., K.C.M.G., Recorder of the said City; George Faudel Phillips, Esq., Lieut.-Col. Horatio David Davies, Esq., Sir John Voce Moore, Knt., Sir Joseph Cockfield Dimsdale, Knt., James Thomson Ritchie, Esq., Walter Vaughan Morgan, Esq., William Purdie Treloar, Esq., John Charles Bell, Esq., other of the Aldermen of the said City; and Sir Forrest Fulton, Knt., Q.C., Common Sergeant of the said City; Her Majesty's Justices of Oyer and Terminer and General Gaol Delivery, holden for the said City, and Judges of the Central Criminal Court; Marcus Samuel, Esq., Alderman, and George Hand, Esq., being Sheriffs; and Thomas Beard, Esq., and

Francis Robert Middleton Phillips, Esq., being Under-Sheriffs.

When Oscar Wilde and Alfred Taylor appeared in the dock before Mr. Justice Charles at the Old Bailey on Friday, April 26th, 1895, to take their trial for the offences with which they were charged, every available seat in the court was occupied. Earl Russell was among the earliest arrivals. Both prisoners listened attentively to the reading of the indictment, which contained no less than twenty-five counts, all of them amounting only to misdemeanour. The one charge of felony—that against Taylor—had been dropped since the proceedings at the police court a week earlier. Wilde's personal appearance had changed little since his committal from Bow Street. He continued to wear the same clothes and carried the same hat. He looked haggard and worn; his long hair, which was carefully arranged when he was last in court—though not in the dock—was now dishevelled. Taylor, on the other hand, was neatly dressed, and appeared not to have suffered from his enforced confinement. But he no longer attempted to regard the proceedings with that indifference which he affected when first before the magistrate. His manner was becomingly grave.

A mild surprise was caused by Sir Edward Clarke interposing when the prisoners had been called upon to plead, but it turned out to be nothing more than a technical objection as to the manner in which the various counts in the indictment had been joined, and an appeal to the judge to call upon the prosecution to elect the specific counts upon which it relied for a conviction.

Both points the judge decided against Sir Edward Clarke. Wilde was first called upon to make his plea, and with perfect coolness answered, "Not guilty." Taylor somewhat sharply responded to the same effect. The prisoners having been accommodated with chairs, the court settled down to listen to Mr. Gill's opening speech for the prosecution. The learned Counsel had little to say that had not already been made public either by Mr. Carson at the Queensberry trial or by Mr. Gill himself at the police court. In referring to the prisoners by name, Mr. Gill made the delicate distinction of mentioning Wilde as "the prisoner Wilde," and Taylor as "the man Taylor." Mr. Gill's speech was impatiently received. Wilde, in common with everyone else, looked terribly bored, and as Mr. Gill continued his reiteration of all the familiar details of how the brothers Parker and the youths Atkins, Wood, Mason, and Shelley became acquainted with the accused men, many of the spectators began to rustle papers, shuffle their feet, and cough loudly—proceedings that called up the usher with frequent requests for silence.

But at last the witnesses were reached, and Charles Parker was called into the box. He was a good-looking young man, some one-and-twenty years of age, and was dressed well and quietly in a blue serge suit, with a high white collar and a neat black bow tie. In his left hand he carried a hard felt hat. His manner in the witness-box was subdued and respectful. His answers were given mostly in monosyllables uttered in a low tone, so low indeed that the judge had more than once to ask him to speak a little more loudly.

During the time he was under cross-examination the witness was watched intently by Wilde, who sat with his head resting on his hand. What the effect of Parker's evidence was upon Wilde it is impossible to say. In striking contrast was the manner of Taylor, who fidgeted about on the chair, and was obviously ill at ease. The cross-examination of the witness was directed chiefly to showing that Wilde in all his meetings with Parker made no attempt at secrecy.

Mr. Grain, cross-examining on behalf of Taylor, established a serious discrepancy in the witness's statements. At Bow Street Parker had said that no misconduct had taken place between himself and Taylor at Camera Square, while now he told Mr. Gill that there had been misconduct. An admission by the witness that, six months after his first meeting with Taylor, he had gone to Paris with an operatic composer caused much speculation as to the identity of the unknown. Parker further admitted, on being re-examined by the prosecution, that he had been introduced to Taylor by Lord Alfred Douglas.

Charles Parker was succeeded in the witness-box by his brother, William. There was a striking likeness between the two youths. William, as his brother, was well dressed. He was just one year older. Beyond corroborating his brother, his evidence was of no moment, and he gave place to a number of female witnesses, who were either landladies or lodgers in the houses where Taylor or some of the witnesses had lived.

The last witness of the day was the notorious Alfred Wood. He was slightly taller than either of

the Parkers, and though the most intellectual looking and the best educated he had the worst record. He was living with Taylor when he received a telegram from Lord Alfred Douglas, asking him to introduce himself to Wilde at the Café Royal. The old story of his negotiations with Wilde for the sale of the letters written by Wilde to Lord Alfred Douglas was again told. The cross-examination of Wood was postponed till the following day.

On Friday, April 26th, 1895, at the Seventh Session of the Central Criminal Court under the Lord Mayoralty of the Right Hon. Sir Joseph Renals, Knt., in the Old Court at the Old Bailey, the trial was begun before Mr. Justice Charles Oscar Fingall O'Flahertie Wills Wilde, author, aged 40, and Alfred Waterhouse Somerset Taylor, of no occupation, aged 33.

There were twenty-five counts in the indictment referring to acts of gross indecency alleged to have been committed by Wilde and the procuring of the said acts by Taylor. Wilde and Taylor were also jointly charged with conspiring and agreeing together to procure the commission of acts of gross indecency by Wilde; Taylor also with committing acts of gross indecency; and Wilde with committing acts of gross indecency with certain persons unknown.

Counsel in the case were Mr. C. F. Gill, Mr. Horace Avory, and Mr. A. Gill, in charge of the prosecution for the Crown on behalf of the Public Prosecutor; Sir Edward Clarke, Q.C., M.P., with Mr. Charles Mathews and Mr. Travers Humphreys, were

for the defendant Oscar Wilde; Mr. J. P. Grain and Mr. Paul Taylor for the other defendant, Alfred Taylor. Mr. Leonard Kershaw held a watching brief on behalf of the witness Sidney A. Mavor.

Mr. Henry A. Read, Clerk of Arraigns, having read out the whole of the indictment, called upon Wilde first to plead. But his Counsel immediately rose with an objection.

Sir Edward Clarke submitted that they could not be called upon to plead to an indictment which contained charges under the Criminal Law Amendment Act and also to charges under the statute relating to conspiracy. There were twenty-five counts, and in respect of those under the Criminal Law Amendment Act the prisoners were competent witnesses on their own behalf, while in respect of the charges of conspiracy they were not competent witnesses and could not be called. Under these circumstances, he contended, the accused could not be put to answer an indictment containing both sets of charges, because if they were called as witnesses they would have to give evidence upon charges in respect to which they were not competent witnesses. Just as a felony and a misdemeanour could not be joined in an indictment, because different modes of trial prevailed, so the offences charged against the prisoners could not be joined in one indictment, because these offences were not consistent with the same method of trial. He therefore demurred to the indictment as containing inconsistent counts.

Mr. C. F. Gill said that the prisoners were charged in the indictment with committing acts under Section

xi of the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885, and they were clearly available witnesses if they desired to give evidence with regard to those charges. The only other charges in the indictment were charges of agreement to commit the acts which they were charged with committing under Section xi of the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885. To give evidence on the first charges would undoubtedly lay them open to cross-examination on both, but there was no hardship in the prisoners being indicted on counts so nearly similar. He cited the case of *Reg. v. Owen* in support of his view.

Sir Edward Clarke said that he was not discussing hardships, but a point of law. He cited the case of *Reg. v. Page*, the only case bearing upon the point, and submitted that that must guide the present case.

Mr. Justice Charles said the question of substance was whether the counts could be lawfully joined, having regard to the present state of the law, in the same indictment. Unquestionably, prior to the passing of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1885, counts for substantive misdemeanours and conspiracies to commit them might be lawfully joined, although, if justice should require it, the prosecution might be called upon to elect on which counts they would proceed. Could they lawfully be joined now? Had it made any difference in criminal pleading that on some counts the defendants were competent witnesses and on others they were not? He (the learned judge) was unable to agree with Sir Edward Clarke's views. He humbly thought that, although the legislature had prescribed that with reference to offences

under the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1885, defendants were competent witnesses, that circumstance had not altered the general law with reference to the joinder of counts for misdemeanour. Although he felt the inconvenience of the present state of things he did not think that the fact that the prisoners were competent witnesses on some counts and were not competent witnesses on the other counts authorised him to say that by law these counts could not be joined in the same indictment.

The accused then both pleaded not guilty.

Sir Edward Clarke next proceeded to ask the Judge in the exercise of his discretion to put the prosecution to its election as to whether it would proceed with the counts of conspiracy or with the other counts.

Mr. Gill replied that the question of election was one entirely in the discretion of the Judge.

His Lordship replied that this was impossible; but he ruled that if the prisoners were called upon to give evidence at all, they might be cross-examined on the whole case, but they would be entitled to give evidence in chief only on the counts of the indictment under the Criminal Law Amendment Act. The fact that the dual indictment was inconvenient would not justify him in requiring the prosecution to abandon one section of it.

OPENING OF THE PROSECUTION

Mr. C. F. Gill then opened the case for the prosecution. He begged the jury to dismiss from their

minds anything they had heard or read about the prisoners and to approach the case with absolutely open minds carefully and impartially. He explained how it was that the prosecution had been instituted by the Director of Public Prosecutions. The charges against the prisoners were in connection with youths who would be called before the jury. The charge against Taylor with regard to some of these youths, if not all of them, was that he acted for the other prisoner, that he procured these youths in order that the prisoner Wilde might have an opportunity of committing acts of gross indecency with them. The prisoners were also charged with an agreement together that youths should be procured in order that the prisoner Wilde might commit those acts with them. On the counts under Section xi of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1885, the defendants could be called as witnesses, if they so desired.

The Judge :—No, Mr. Gill, I do not agree with that at all. If they give evidence they may be cross-examined on the whole case, but they will be entitled to give evidence in chief only on the counts under the Criminal Law Amendment Act.

Mr. Gill, continuing, gave an outline of the circumstances of the case as alleged on the part of the prosecution, and briefly indicated what the evidence would be which would be adduced for the prosecution. There would be ample corroboration of the statements made by the young men, Charles and William Parker, at Bow Street. The statute did not require in cases of misdemeanour that there should be corroboration, but it was desirable there should be corroboration if it

could possibly be obtained. Anyhow, there would be abundant corroboration by independent evidence and by documentary testimony of the story told by the two Parkers. Wilde was well known as an author, and had resided until his arrest at a house in Tite Street, Chelsea. Despite the fact that Wilde had a house in Tite Street, he had at different times occupied rooms in St. James's Place, the Savoy Hotel, and the Albemarle Hotel. It would be shown that Wilde and Taylor were in league for certain purposes. Taylor about two years ago took at a rental of £3 a month the upper rooms of a closed baker's shop in Little College Street, Westminster. The rooms he had furnished in a remarkable manner, draped and furnished in a curious way. He was a man without any profession. He had no servant in these rooms.

Counsel then proceeded to describe Taylor's rooms with their heavily-draped windows, their candles burning on through the day, and the languorous atmosphere heavy with perfume. Here, he said, men met together; and here Wilde was introduced by Taylor to youths who would give evidence in this case. Analysing the indictment, Mr. Gill said that the first nine counts referred to misconduct with the lads named Parker; the next three to Frederick Atkins; two more to incidents at the Savoy Hotel; two to the young man Mavor; three to charges of conspiracy; five to Alfred Wood; and the last to Wilde's conduct in regard to the lad named Shelley.

Taking these in their order, Counsel roundly accused Taylor of corrupting the first-named lads and inducing them to meet Wilde by assuring them that

he was liberal in his payments. In regard to Taylor the most serious counts of the indictment charged him with attempting to commit the actual felony of sodomy with both the lads named Parker, whose evidence was abundantly corroborated.

Mr. Gill then went over the facts which had already been adduced in connection with the Queensberry case, and the police court proceedings, as to Wilde's alleged relations with the Parkers, Atkins, Mavor, and Wood; and with the attempt of the last-named to extort blackmail. There was a difference about Wilde's acquaintance with Shelley, said Mr. Gill—the lad whom he met in the shop of his publishers, Messrs. Mathews and Lane, where he was employed. It was an acquaintance with a literary side, but it went through the same stages.

Suddenly concluding, when he seemed to be only in the middle of his summary of the case, with an assurance that the evidence which he would call would justify the jury in finding prisoners guilty on all counts, Mr. Gill proceeded to call his first witness, Charles Parker.

EVIDENCE OF CHARLES PARKER

Charles Parker, a slim, clean-shaven lad with a fair, girlish face, deposed as follows:—

I am 21 years of age. In the beginning of 1893 I was out of employment. I have a brother, William, who was also out of employment. I have been engaged as a valet; my brother as a groom. I remember one day being with my brother at the St.

James's Restaurant—in the bar. While there Taylor came up and spoke to us. He was an entire stranger. He passed the compliments of the day, and asked us to have a drink. We got into conversation with him. He spoke about men.

In what way?—I think he asked us if we ever went with men. He said there was a lot of money to be made in that way. He mentioned Oscar Wilde, saying he was a very good man for giving money to boys he liked. Taylor said that he himself lived at 13, Little College Street, Westminster. He told us that he thought we should suit Mr. Wilde very nicely. After giving Taylor our address we parted. Taylor asked us to visit him the next day at Little College Street. We went the next morning. Taylor told us then that he had arranged that we should be introduced to Mr. Wilde the next evening at a restaurant, and that we were to meet him (Taylor) at the St. James's bar. We went the next evening to the St. James's and saw Taylor there. He took us to a restaurant in Rupert Street. I think it was the Solferino. We were shown upstairs to a private room, in which there was a dinner-table laid for four. After a while Wilde came in. I had never seen him before, but I had heard of him. We dined about eight o'clock. We all four sat down to dinner, Wilde sitting on my left.

Was the dinner a good dinner?—Yes. The table was lighted with red-shaded candles. We had champagne with our dinner, and brandy and coffee afterwards. Wilde paid for the dinner. Subsequently Wilde said to me, "This is the boy for me—will you

go to the Savoy Hotel with me?" I consented, and Wilde drove me in a cab to the hotel. He took me first into a sitting-room on the second floor, where he ordered some more drink—whisky and soda. Wilde then asked me to go into his bedroom with him.

Witness here described certain acts of indecency which he alleged took place in the bedroom. Wilde meanwhile from the dock gazed at the witness fixedly and showed no traces of embarrassment.

Witness continuing:—Before I left, Wilde gave me £2, telling me to call at the Savoy Hotel in a week. I went there about a week afterwards at eleven o'clock at night. We had supper, with champagne. Wilde on that occasion committed the same acts as on the first occasion. I stayed about two hours. When I left, Wilde gave me £3. I remember subsequently going with my brother to 13, Little College Street. We slept there with Taylor. Taylor told us on that occasion that he had gone through a form of marriage with a youth named Mason.

Did he say who acted as the woman?—Yes; he said he did; that he was in woman's dress, and that they had a wedding breakfast.

Witness here related proposals said to have been made by Taylor for the commission of indecencies to which Parker would not consent. He gave positive evidence as to the commission of acts of gross indecency at Taylor's rooms in Chapel Street.

Continuing, witness said:—I had for a fortnight or three weeks a bedroom at 50, Park Walk, Chelsea. I had stayed with Taylor at Chapel Street for about a fortnight. At the time I was living at Park Walk,

Wilde visited me there one night at half-past eleven or twelve. He came in a cab, and drove away after staying about a quarter of an hour. Wilde kept his cab standing outside. In consequence of this incident my landlady gave me notice to leave, and I left.

Apart from money, did Wilde give you any presents?—Yes; he gave me a silver cigarette case and a gold ring.

You pawned the cigarette case and the ring?—Yes.

Examination continued:—I visited Wilde at St. James's Place, Taylor having given me the address. Wilde had a bedroom and a sitting-room opening into each other. I have been there in the morning, and to tea in the afternoon.

Witness here described an act of indecency which he alleged took place with Wilde on one of these occasions.

Witness, continuing:—I remember dining with Wilde at Kettner's, and then going to the London Pavilion. We went back to St. James's Place, where the same thing occurred as before. I committed an act of indecency with Wilde at the Albemarle Hotel. The last time I saw Wilde was about nine months ago when walking in Trafalgar Square. Wilde was riding in a cab. He stopped and spoke to me. He asked me how I was, and told me I was looking as pretty as ever.

Counsel elicited from witness a piece of evidence against Wilde which, if reliable, would have been more serious than anything mentioned in the case.

During the period of your acquaintance with Wilde did you frequently see Taylor?—Yes.

Who else did you meet at Little College Street?—
Atkins, Wood, and Scarfe amongst others.

Did you continue your acquaintance with Taylor until a certain incident occurred—you were arrested?—Yes.

Mr. Grain rose to protest against the introduction of matter extraneous to the indictment. “Surely, I have enough to answer,” he added.

Mr. Gill explained that he wished to show that Parker ceased his acquaintance with Taylor after that incident. Counsel then asked the witness:—

When did you cease your association with Taylor? In August, 1894. I went away into the country and took up another occupation.

The Judge:—What was the occupation?—I enlisted. While I was with my regiment I was seen by Mr. Charles Russell, Lord Queensberry’s solicitor, and he took down a statement from me.

Mr. Gill:—Until you became acquainted with Taylor had you ever been mixed up with men in the commission of indecent acts?—No, never.

This closed the examination in chief of this witness, and the court adjourned for luncheon.

CHARLES PARKER CROSS-EXAMINED

When the court resumed, Sir Edward Clarke proceeded to cross-examine the witness Charles Parker.

On what day did you enlist?—On the 3rd of September. Mr. Russell came to see me about this case at the latter end of March. That was the first I had heard of these matters. I enlisted in my own

name. I do not know how Mr. Russell found me out. I stated at the police court that I had received £30, part of moneys extorted from a gentleman with whom I had committed acts of indecency. I received the £30 a few days before I was arrested in August, 1894. I can't remember the exact date, but it was a month or two before I enlisted.

I don't ask the name of the gentleman from whom the money was extorted, but I do ask the names of the two men who got the money and gave you £30.—Wood and Allen. I could not tell you where Allen is now. He used to live in Crawford Street. Wood is a witness in this case, I know.

When had the incident occurred in consequence of which you received the £30—how long before?—I cannot think.

You had had indecent behaviour with the gentleman in question?—Yes; but only on one occasion, at Camera Square, Chelsea.

Where you were living?—Yes.

Did the gentleman come to your room?—Yes.

By your invitation?—He asked me if he could come.

And you took him home with you?—Yes.

Did Wood and Allen happen to come in while the gentleman was there?—No.

How much did Wood and Allen tell you they got?—I can't remember.

Try and remember.—£300 or £400.

Was that the first sum of money you had received under circumstances of that kind?—Yes.

What did you do with the £30?—Spent it.

And then went into the army?—I spent it in about a couple of days.

At the request of Sir Edward Clarke, the witness wrote down the name and address of his late employer.

Witness continued:—I was in that gentleman's service as valet for nine or ten months. I did not leave the place without a character.

Did not you say that your employer had stated that you had stolen some clothes?—Yes.

How did you know that he had said so?—He wrote and told me so, and asked me to send the things back, which I did. They were not clothes, they were shirts and collars.

Well, I call them clothes. Did you have a written character?—Yes.

But was not that written before the robbery of the clothes was discovered?—Yes, that is so.

Did you ever live at D'Oyley Street, Chelsea?—No, never.

Do you know a person named Thurr?—No.

When Taylor asked you if you ever went with men and got money for it, did you understand what he meant?—Yes.

You had heard of such things before?—Yes.

Then it was with the intention of entering upon such practices that you called upon Taylor?—No.

Then why did you call upon him?—Because he asked me to.

You meant to go with men and get money?—Yes.

You understood the practices you were going to enter upon?—Yes. I told Wilde that I wanted to

get some employment on the stage. I knew that Wilde was a dramatist, and had much to do with theatres; and I suggested that he might help me. He showed curiosity about my family and affairs, and I told him my father was a horse dealer.

When you allowed yourself to be introduced to Mr. Wilde you knew perfectly well the purpose for which the introduction was made?—Yes.

At the dinner Mr. Wilde was the principal conversationalist, I suppose?—Yes.

And you found him a brilliant and an amusing talker?—Yes.

Cross-examination continued:—On the first visit to the Savoy Hotel Wilde locked the bedroom door. I did not see any servants as I left the hotel. I went away in a hansom. As to the second visit, Wilde told me the night and the time to come again. I found Wilde occupying the same rooms. I gave my name and the hall porter showed me up by the lift. Wilde on this occasion, too, locked the bedroom door. The waiter who served the supper of course saw me there. It was on the second or third floor: I cannot be certain which. In the sitting-room Mr. Wilde rang a bell for the waiter, and the waiter went for drinks and brought them in. The sitting-room and bedroom opened one into the other. Mr. Wilde did not lock the sitting-room door, but he locked that of the bedroom. I did not know Mr. Wilde even by sight till I was introduced to him at the restaurant. I did not see anybody but a hall boy at the hotel entrance.

There was no concealment about your visit, was there? You gave your name, were shown up, and in

going away you did not attempt to avoid any of the servants?—That's so.

Had other people besides Mr. Wilde been to see you at your room in Park Walk?—Yes; Taylor used to call upon me there—in the morning.

Did Wood come?—No.

Allen?—No; I knew Allen only a little while before I enlisted. About the same time I became acquainted with, Cliburn.

If you did not know either of them before that, from whom did you hear about the letters which Wood had?—I can't remember. I heard that Wood had gone to America, and that he had in his possession some letters written by Mr. Wilde. I thought he had taken them away with him.

Did you hear that Wood had stolen them?—No.

Did you know how Wood got possession of them?—Yes.

From whom did you hear that?—I don't remember.

Did you hear that Wood had got £20 or £30 from Mr. Wilde for some letters?—I did not hear that he got the money. I heard from someone, I can't remember from whom, that Wood got the letters out of some clothes which were given to him by Lord Alfred Douglas. I never saw the letters.

Were Wilde's rooms on the ground floor at St. James's Place very public ones?—Yes. There were men-servants about. The sitting-room was a sort of library—there were a good many books about.

Do you suggest that in rooms such as you have

described and so situated this kind of conduct went on again and again?—Yes.

There was not the smallest concealment about your visit with Mr. Wilde to the music-hall?—No.

You shared a box with him at the Pavilion?—Yes.

Cross-examined by Mr. Grain, on behalf of Taylor:—I know a person of the name of Harrington. I made his acquaintance at the Skating Rink at Knightsbridge some time before I met Taylor.

Now were you not introduced to Taylor by Harrington?—No; I think Harrington was at the St. James's bar, but he did not make the introduction.

Did Wood frequently visit you at Camera Square?—Yes.

Are you quite sure that the sum of £30 mentioned by Sir Edward Clarke is the only sum you have received under similar circumstances?—Yes.

Had Wood ever suggested persons to you from whom he might obtain money, and that you might participate in it?—No.

Quite sure of that?—Yes, quite. I was hard up at the time, but not in debt. I had a few shillings in my pocket.

Did you say at Bow Street that when you stayed with Taylor at 3, Chapel Street, every night for a fortnight—“He did nothing to me, and I did nothing to him”?—I suppose I must have said so.

About six months after you made the acquaintance of Taylor did you go to Paris?—Yes.

Did you go with a composer?—Yes.

An operatic composer?—Yes.

How long were you with that person in Paris?—

About a month. I went with him as valet. He paid me two guineas a week. I lived at a different place to the gentleman, but went every morning to his residence to valet him.

Do you know a person of the name of Burton?—Yes. I knew that Atkins and Burton were living together at the same place.

Did you go to Monte Carlo with Burton?—Yes, in 1894. We only stayed a few days.

Did Wood go with you?—No.

Re-examined by Mr. Gill:—Did you know Lord Alfred Douglas?—Yes. Taylor introduced me to him. I know that the letters referred to belonged to Lord Alfred Douglas. Until I met Taylor I did not know Atkins, Wood, Allen, Cliburn, or Burton.

When did you first make the acquaintance of Wood?—About six months before he went to America.

THE EVIDENCE OF WILLIAM PARKER

William Parker was next called, and, in answer to Mr. Gill's questions, said he was a groom. He bore out his brother's evidence with reference to the meeting of Taylor in the St. James's Restaurant bar, and the subsequent dinner with Mr. Wilde at the Solferino in Rupert Street. In addition the witness spoke as to what was alleged to have taken place in Little College Street on a certain night when he and his brother slept with Taylor in one bed. Witness described an attempt made by Taylor to commit a felonious act. Witness went twice to Little College

Street. Shortly afterwards he went into the country, where he obtained employment, and he had had nothing more to do with Taylor or with Mr. Wilde.

Cross-examined by Sir Edward Clarke:—What employment did you go into?—As a groom. After going away from the dinner, I went home after having had a drink or two.

Hadn't you had enough at the dinner?—I know when I have had enough.

Did you know when you went with your brother to the dinner that you were to be treated as women, and that you were to have money for it?—That was what I understood.

OTHER EVIDENCE

Mrs. Ellen Grant, of 13, Little College Street, deposed that Taylor had lodged at her house, No. 13, for a year and eight months. He had four rooms there, and paid £3 a month. He kept no servant, and did his own cooking on a gas stove. The windows of his rooms were covered with strained art muslin and dark curtains and lace curtains. They were furnished sumptuously, and were lighted by different coloured lamps and candles. The windows were never opened or cleaned, and the daylight was never admitted. It could not come in, the curtains being always drawn. There was no bedstead, but there was a spring mattress on the floor of the bedroom.

What have you seen in the rooms in the shape of apparel?—I have seen a woman's wig and shoes and stockings. I never saw any dress.

Was there any scent there?—Yes.

Much of it?—Mr. Taylor used to burn scent. Mr. Taylor's night shirt, I noticed, was fastened by a gold brooch pin.

Were Taylor's visitors, as a class, women or men?—Men—young men from sixteen to thirty. I have seen Alfred Wood there. He once stayed for three weeks. Others were Sidney Mavor, Charles Mason, and Ernest Macklin. Mavor and Mason stayed there for nights with Taylor. There were frequent tea parties.

Who came to them—men or women?—Oh, always gentlemen. Taylor used to address his visitors by their Christian names—“Charlie dear” and “Dear boy.” I have heard Taylor talking to someone he called “Oscar,” but I have never seen Mr. Wilde there. Taylor left his rooms in August, 1893.

Before he left had a sergeant of police been there?—Yes.

And you showed him Taylor's rooms by the officer's request?—Yes.

By Sir Edward Clarke:—I never saw Mr. Wilde in the house.

Mr. Grain:—You understood that the wig and other things were used by Taylor for fancy dress?—Yes; fancy dress.

By Mr. Gill:—The house, 13, Little College Street, is a very old-fashioned one. The ground-floor was originally a baker's shop.

Mrs. Lucy Rumsby deposed to having let a bedroom to Charles Parker at 50, Park Walk, Chelsea, in 1893. When he had been there a fortnight she gave

him notice to quit in consequence of the complaint of another lodger.

Mrs. Margery Bancroft, a tenant of the house, stated that Taylor used to call upon Charles Parker. Late one night someone drove up to the house in a cab and entered the house. Afterwards she heard someone going downstairs, and, looking out of the window, she saw Mr. Wilde enter the cab. She complained to the landlady next morning. She knew Mr. Wilde through his having previously been pointed out to her.

Mrs. Sophia Gray testified that Taylor lodged with her at 3, Chapel Street, from August to December, 1893. Wilde was there on only one occasion, when he stopped but a few minutes. She spoke about other visitors of Taylor's, and repeated the evidence she had previously given at Bow Street police court.

Frederick Kearley, a retired detective-inspector, spoke to finding amongst documents left behind by Taylor the piece of paper on which Charles Parker had written his address at the St. James's Restaurant.

EVIDENCE OF ALFRED WOOD

Alfred Wood was the next witness called. He was examined by Mr. Avory for the prosecution. Being sworn, he said: I was formerly a clerk. In January, 1893, I was not in any occupation. I first knew Taylor about that time.

When did you go to Little College Street to live?
—In January, 1893. I stayed about three weeks.

Where did you sleep there?—In the same room

with Taylor. There was only one bed there.

When did you first know Wilde?—About a month after I made the acquaintance of Taylor.

How did you come to know Wilde?—I was introduced to him by a gentleman at the Café Royal.

Who was the gentleman?—Must I give the name?

Yes.—Lord Alfred Douglas.

What took place when you were introduced to Wilde?—I was introduced by telegram.

The Judge:—You would have led anyone to believe that you were personally introduced.

Witness:—In consequence of the telegram I went to the Café Royal at nine o'clock one evening. Mr. Wilde was sitting down. He spoke to me first. He asked, "Are you Alfred Wood?" I said, "Yes." Then he offered me something to drink and I had something; and then he invited me to go round to the Florence, in Rupert Street, to dinner. I went with him and we dined in a private room.

Mr. Avory:—What kind of meal was it?—Very nice; one of the best to be got.

What wine did you have?—Champagne. After dinner I went with Mr. Wilde to 16, Tite Street. There was nobody in the house to my knowledge. Mr. Wilde let himself in with a latchkey. We went up to a bedroom where we had hock and seltzer.

Witness then stated that an act of gross indecency took place on this occasion.

Did he give you any money that night?—Yes; at the Florence. About £3 I think it was. He said he thought I must need some money to buy some things with. The money was given before any suggestion

was made about going to Tite Street. I stayed in his house about an hour. He asked me to meet him again at the corner of Tite Street. Two or three days after, about 11 p.m., I went to the corner. Mr. Wilde came up in a cab, and we both went into the house. I had some chicken in the pantry, and afterwards went to the bedroom, where we had something to drink. I don't remember committing any act of indecency that night. I stayed only a very short time. I don't remember that I ever went again to Tite Street.

Did you ever meet Wilde again?—He once came to my room in Langham Street.

Did you know he was coming?—Yes.

How did you know?—He came by appointment. He took me out to buy me a present. He bought me half-a-dozen shirts, some collars, and handkerchiefs, and a silver watch and chain. Before he took me out we had some tea.

Has he given you money on any other occasion?—Yes; he has given me two or three pounds when he has met me.

Up to what time did your acquaintanceship with Wilde go on?—Up to the end of March.

How did it cease?—I told Taylor that I would like to get away from a certain class of people, and I think I mentioned it to Mr. Wilde, who gave me £30. I saw him at Taylor's rooms.

What took place between you?—Mr. Wilde asked me, if I wanted to go away to America. I said, “Yes,” and then he said he would give me the money. He said, “You have some letters I should like to get back,” and he gave me £30.

In what form?—Two £10 notes and two £5 notes.

Was it a fact that you had any letters of his in your possession?—Yes. I don't remember how many, nor do I remember giving them back to Mr. Wilde. I might have put them on the table.

Did the letters belong to you?—No. They were letters I found in some clothes Lord Alfred Douglas had given me. They were letters from Mr. Wilde to Lord Alfred Douglas. I saw Mr. Wilde at the Florence next day. He had invited me to lunch with him there.

What sort of a lunch was it?—Very nice lunch. We had champagne. While at lunch Mr. Wilde said, "£30 is very little to go to America with, and I will send you £5," which he did by messenger. I went to America two or three days afterwards.

Do you know a lad named Sidney Mavor?—Yes; I met him at Taylor's rooms. He was known there as Sidney.

At this stage the court adjourned for the day.

xi.—THE SECOND DAY OF THE TRIAL ¹

Five hours were spent on Saturday, April 27th, in investigating the charges preferred against Oscar Wilde and Alfred Taylor. Half an hour before the time appointed for the opening of the court the accused were brought down from Holloway in the prison van and lodged in separate cells. When the judge took his seat, the two men were placed in the dock and occupied chairs provided for them as on the previous day, Wilde in the right-hand corner, where he resumed his usual attitude, leaning his arm on the rail and resting his head heavily upon his closed hand. There was the same dreamy air about him, but a sickly pallor had seized upon his countenance. He betrayed too a great deal of nervous anxiety, now and again heaving deep sighs as some specially incriminating evidence was brought out by the prosecution. He seemed utterly broken down, nor did the vigorous cross-examination of Sir Edward Clarke appear to afford him any mental relief. Occasionally he took a pen and scribbled a note to his solicitor, who seemed to have some difficulty in deciphering the caligraphy. Taylor, too, was very busy throughout the hearing with verbal and written communications to those responsible for his defence. He wore again his singular smile, and appeared to be in the best of spirits. But towards the end of the day a deep

crimson flush came over his face, which may have been due to the heated atmosphere of the court or to excitement caused by the somewhat dramatic episode which occurred towards the close of the sitting. It was the second day of the trial, and the gravamen of the charge had already been reached; the interest of the day's proceedings being largely in the cross-examination of witnesses, which, it will be seen, was by no means ineffectual. It was an impressive scene when the witness Atkins was ordered by the judge to leave the witness-box after admitting a fact which previously he had strenuously denied.

The court was perhaps less crowded than on the previous day. The junior Bar, which at the Queensberry trial had made a demonstration in force, was only sparsely represented. The public gallery over the clock was full, and there the interest displayed by the public was as great as ever, but on the whole there seemed to be some decline in the morbid interest that had hitherto been exhibited.

The gentlemen of the jury having answered to their names, Alfred Wood, the youth who had given damaging evidence against the prisoners—and himself—was recalled for cross-examination, and everyone was in a high state of expectancy as to how he would fare under the manipulation of Sir Edward Clarke. The witness bore himself with quiet composure, answering without perturbation the most compromising questions as to his own conduct with Wilde and the part he took in certain blackmailing operations with Allen. With the utmost nonchalance he admitted that, after his return from America he

received a large sum of money—he did not know exactly how much—which he and Allen had extorted from a gentleman by threats of exposure. Wood had represented to Wilde, when the latter gave him £30, that he was anxious to go to America to get away from “a certain class of persons.” He admitted that he obtained employment in America, and so far had a chance of leading a decent life, but with equal promptitude and coolness he confessed that on his return to England he rejoined his former companions, Allen and the Parkers, and set up with them in the blackmailing business. He asserted, however, that £175 was the only sum he had received as the proceeds of extortion beyond the money which Wilde paid him for Lord Alfred Douglas’s correspondence.

Re-examination by Mr. C. F. Gill elicited the fact that there were other people concerned in the transactions which the trial at the Old Bailey brought to light. After giving his evidence Wood remained in court, seemingly in no way abashed by the undisguised disgust with which he had been regarded by the judge and by everyone else except the prosecution.

Evidence of Wilde’s occupation of certain chambers having been given, Frederick Atkins was called, and there answered to the requisition a somewhat burly, clean-faced young fellow, wearing a long blue Newmarket coat, which when opened disclosed a corduroy waistcoat of a sporting pattern. Atkins’s appearance was a revelation to some in court. He described himself as a bookmaker’s clerk, but he was quickly recognised as “Fred Denny,” a low comedian of the minor music-halls. Atkins answered questions

in a raucous voice. He was introduced to Taylor, he said, by a son of Colonel Schwabe—a name mentioned for the first time—and by Taylor to Wilde, with whom he went to Paris as his private secretary. While in Paris, Atkins had his hair curled, under directions given, as he said, by Wilde in French to the hairdresser. When they returned to London, Wilde presented Atkins with a silver cigarette case and some money. He positively denied having had any criminal relations with Wilde.

Having elicited that Wilde took Atkins over to Paris in order to oblige Mr. Schwabe, who had promised him the trip, Sir Edward Clarke, in a most serious manner, tackled the witness as to his knowledge of a man named Burton, a bookmaker. Atkins admitted knowing Burton—had known him all his life—and had lived with him for some years. Counsel then opened the way for more specific questions by asking whether the witness and Burton had not been engaged together in blackmailing. He adroitly replied that he never got money in that way himself—neither did Burton. Although cautioned to be careful, Atkins swore that he never decoyed a Birmingham gentleman into his rooms, that Burton did not burst in, and that they did not extort a large sum of money from their victim. All this he swore never took place. His questions put upon this point Sir Edward derived from information contained in a letter which he held in his hand. Equally strenuous and ready was Atkins in denying that he and Burton had ever been arrested for demanding money from a gentleman he had taken to his rooms and robbed. Again witness

denied that a gentleman he had inveigled to his lodgings had given Burton a cheque for a large sum. He furthermore explicitly swore that it was untrue to say that he and another man had taken two American gentlemen to an hotel, and that Burton suddenly appeared on the scene and extorted money from them. He had, he protested, never been to the hotel at all. Once more he swore that he and Burton had not been engaged in blackmailing during a visit to Nice.

Next Mr. Grain, on behalf of Taylor, fell upon the witness, handing him a slip of paper with a name written thereon. Did not he and Burton, while staying at Scarborough, blackmail a foreign nobleman of a sum of about £500? No. Did not Atkins take an old gentleman from the city to his lodgings in Westminster, rob him of a pocket-book, and threaten to expose him on account of its contents, unless he gave him some money? No. These negative replies were so emphatically given as to create the impression that Counsel had been misled by his information.

But later there came a sensational surprise. Atkins, who had been dismissed from the witness-box, was recalled by Sir Edward Clarke later in the afternoon. The learned Counsel handed up to the Judge a paper which was an extract from the records of Rochester Row police station. Both by Counsel and by the Judge the witness was sternly warned to be careful in the replies he gave to the questions that were about to be asked him. Atkins, confronted with Police-Constable 396 A of the Metropolitan Police, then admitted that on a certain day in June, 1891, he and

Burton had been taken to the police station. Was it for demanding money with menaces? No—he didn't think it was; it was for hitting a gentleman he had met at the Alhambra and had taken home to his rooms at Tachbrook Street. Pressed strongly, Atkins further admitted that a certain statement had been made at the police station. The gentleman in question declining to prosecute, the two blackmailers were liberated. "You swore upon your oath," said Sir Edward to the witness, "that you had not been in custody at all and that you had never been taken to Rochester Row? How came you to tell me those lies?" The witness's excuse was a lapse of memory, and when ordered to leave the court he obeyed with alacrity.

Two other witnesses were examined before this episode occurred—Sidney Mavor and Edward Shelley. The former, a tall, gentlemanly young fellow, admitted that he had stayed with Wilde at an hotel, but denied most positively, and in a manner which appeared to convince the court of his truthfulness, that he had ever been guilty of any offence with Wilde.

Brought up in the unhealthy atmosphere of a publisher's store, the excitable, morbid youth Shelley expressed horror at what he said Wilde had done to him, yet admitted (and was forced to admit) that he had visited him again on several subsequent occasions. He was very uneasy in the witness-box, his feet being in incessant motion during his examination. He became acquainted with Wilde through the latter going to the office of the publishing firm in which he

was a clerk. He knew he had "sinned," but explained that when he found out that Wilde was an immoral man he wrote severing the acquaintanceship. Sir Edward Clarke, however, confronted the witness with a series of letters which he had sent to Wilde after the date when he was supposed to have written breaking off the connection, letters in which he addressed Wilde as "My dear Oscar," and subscribed himself as "Ever yours" and "Yours always sincerely." Asked how, if he had concluded Wilde was an immoral man, he came to write such letters, the witness could reply only that he thought Wilde was very sorry for what had happened, while he (Shelley) tried to forget the occurrence. Witness pleaded also that his mind was disordered by too much studying. One fact Shelley was compelled to confess, that when in custody for assaulting his father he had communicated with Mr. Wilde with a view to his becoming bail for him. The witness, who had a very drastic half-hour of it, seemed immensely relieved by his release from the witness-box.

The trial of Oscar Wilde and Alfred Taylor, charged on twenty-five counts with committing acts of gross indecency and conspiracy, was resumed at the Old Bailey before Mr. Justice Charles on Saturday, April 27th. The same Counsel appeared as on the previous day.

The witness, Alfred Wood, who had given evidence on the previous day for the prosecution, was recalled for cross-examination on behalf of the defence.

CROSS-EXAMINATION OF WOOD

Alfred Wood was cross-examined by Sir Edward Clarke. He said that he went to America in 1893, and returned in the following year. He represented to Mr. Wilde in 1893 that he wished to get away from the class of persons he was connected with, and it was by that representation that he obtained the £30 from Mr. Wilde.

When you came back from America in May, 1894, did you return to respectable employment?—I was taken ill on my return, and have been very ill since.

I take that to mean that you have not been in any describable employment?—Yes.

Charles Parker has told us that you and a man named Allen obtained £300 or £400 from a gentleman, and that you gave him £30. Is that true?

The witness hesitated, and then replied:—I didn't get the money. It wasn't paid to me.

Well, tell us. Did you get £300 from a gentleman?—Not me. Allen did.

You were a party to it?—I was there, yes.

Do you mean by that, that you came into the room whilst the gentleman was there with Parker?—I did not; Allen went in first.

At all events Allen and you got £300 or £400 from the gentleman?—Yes.

And you gave Parker £30?—I did not; Allen might have done. I don't know the exact amount he got.

How much did you get?—£175.

What for?—Well, it was given me by Allen.

Then Mr. Wilde's giving you £30 to get away from this class of person had not a very satisfactory result?—I was in employment all the time I was in America.

The witness appeared to be chewing something all the time this evidence was being extracted from him.

How did you live when you came back?—On some money left me by my father. I was not of age when I went to America.

Was that before you had the £175?—No.

When were you last in respectable employment in England?—A short time before I met Mr. Wilde.

Give me the date.—It is so long ago I don't remember it.

Write on a slip of paper the name where you were last employed, and the date.—I do not want it disclosed.

The witness thereupon wrote down the name and address of his last respectable employer. The slip was handed to the Judge and passed on to Counsel.

Sir Edward Clarke:—But you have not given the date.

Witness:—I cannot recollect it.

What were you there?—A junior clerk.

Now, did you leave there in 1891?—I cannot say. I think it must have been at the end of 1892.

How old were you when you left that employment?—(The witness gave no audible reply.)

Did you leave under circumstances creditable to yourself?—Yes; I left about three years ago.

Since you left have you ever had a salary from anybody in England?—No.

How did you live then?—Money left me by my father.

Anything else?—I have been helping my brother.

How long have you known Allen?—Just before I went to America.

At what date was it that you came into possession of those letters of which you spoke?—At the time I went to Oxford, between January and March, 1893.

How long were they in your possession?—Only a few days.

What?—They were lying about my rooms for a long time.

Did you hand them to anybody else?—No.

Did you receive a letter from Sir George Lewis?—
Yes.

To your knowledge had one of those letters been copied before you received that letter?—I don't know. No; not to my knowledge was one copied.

When you gave the letters back, or left them on the table, or whatever it was you did with them, did you know that there was one which you did not give back?—Yes.

Where was that one?—Allen had it.

Did you give it to him?—No; he took it out of my pocket.

Did it remain in Allen's possession?—I don't know. I didn't want to have it back.

Did you say at the police court that you were the worse for drink when you went on the first occasion with Mr. Wilde to Tite Street?—Yes.

Were you the worse for drink?—Yes.

How long before you were examined at the police

court did you make a statement to someone—a solicitor, for instance?—It was just after the arrest of Lord Queensberry.

Who came to see you about taking your statement?—Mr. Littlechild, the detective.

How did he find you out?—I don't know.

Where were you living then?—Holloway.

Have you ever since you came back from America visited Charles Parker?—Yes, at Camera Square.

Have you stayed there?—No.

Re-examined by Mr. C. F. Gill:—At the beginning of 1893 was your father alive?—No.

When you were at home, with whom did you live?—My mother.

Had you been guilty of any acts of indecency before you knew Wilde?—No, not with any man until I went to College Street.

How did you get the letters?—I found them in the pockets of some clothes which were given to me at Oxford.

Did Allen take more than one of the letters?—Yes.

And did he give them all back but one?—Yes.

Did you know that he was keeping one?—Yes.

Were the people from whom you wanted to get away, when you went to America, people whose names have been mentioned here?—Some of them were, and there were others.

Whom did you mean by the class of people you had been mixed up with?—I meant not only Wilde and Taylor, but several others whose names have not been mentioned.

Mr. Grain:—When you first met Wilde it was because of a telegram?—Yes.

That telegram was not from Taylor?—No.

The Judge:—He said yesterday whom it was from.

EVIDENCE OF THOMAS PRICE

Thomas Price, a waiter at a private hotel at 10, St. James's Place, said the prisoner Wilde had rooms there from October, 1893, to April, 1894. The rooms were on the ground floor, and consisted of a bedroom and a sitting-room communicating. He recognised the prisoner Taylor, and he had seen him at St. James's Place on one occasion. Charles Parker came there five or six times. He used to ask for Mr. Wilde, and was shown into Mr. Wilde's rooms. He lunched there once. Witness knew Atkins by sight. He had called there twice. Scarfe called five or six times, and Barford about the same number of times. Mr. Wilde had a latchkey, but never slept there more than a dozen times. He generally arrived about eleven o'clock in the morning, did some literary work, went out to lunch, and returned in the afternoon.

EVIDENCE OF FREDERICK ATKINS

Frederick Atkins, a stout youth, who described himself as a bookmaker's clerk and a comedian, was next called. He said, on being examined by Mr. Avory, that he was twenty years old. He was introduced to Taylor by a young fellow named Schwabe in

November, 1892, and afterwards by Taylor to Mr. Wilde and Lord Alfred Douglas at a dinner at the Florence.

Mr. Avory:—What happened at the dinner?—Oscar Wilde kissed the waiter.

Did he ask you to go to Paris with him?—Yes. We were seated at the table, and he put his arm round me and said he liked me. I arranged to meet him two days afterwards at Victoria Station, and went to Paris with him as his private secretary. We stayed at 29, Boulevard des Capucines. We had two rooms there—a bed-sitting-room and a bedroom, one leading into the other. The day after we got to Paris I did some writing for him. Afterwards I lunched at the Café Julien with him. We went for a drive in the afternoon. Next day we went to a hairdresser's, and I had my hair cut.

Did you tell him to curl it?—No; he did it on his own account.

Wilde was there?—Yes, he was having his hair cut, and was talking to the man in French all the time. After dinner on the second day we were in Paris I went to the Moulin Rouge. Mr. Wilde told me not to go, but I went. I had to pay to go in. I had some money Mr. Wilde had given me.

By the Judge:—Mr. Wilde told him not to go to see those women, as women were the ruin of young fellows. Mr. Wilde spoke several times about the same subject, and always to the same effect.

Continuing his evidence, witness said he got back to the rooms very late. Mr. Wilde was in bed. He went into his room and had something to drink.

Schwabe, the person who introduced witness to Wilde, was in bed with him. Witness went to bed by himself. Before he got out of bed in the morning Mr. Wilde came into his room. That was about nine o'clock. He talked about the Moulin Rouge, and witness told Wilde that he had enjoyed himself. Mr. Wilde said to him, "Shall I come into bed with you?" Witness replied that it was time to get up. Mr. Wilde did not get into bed with him. A waiter came into the room with the breakfast, and after drinking a cup of coffee witness got up. The man he saw in bed with Mr. Wilde was about twenty-two years of age. Witness returned to London with Mr. Wilde, who gave him a silver cigarette case. Mr. Wilde addressed him as "Fred," and he called Mr. Wilde "Oscar." Witness afterwards visited Mr. Wilde at Tite Street, and subsequently Wilde called on witness at Osnaburgh Street. On the latter occasion there was also present a young man named Harry Barford. Witness knew Sidney Mavor by sight, and had heard him called "Jenny" Mavor. Witness once went to St. James's Place to see Mr. Wilde.

FREDERICK ATKINS CROSS-EXAMINED

Sir Edward Clarke:—Were you ill at Osnaburgh Street?—Yes; I had small-pox and was removed to the hospital ship. Before I went I asked Barford to write to Mr. Wilde requesting him to come and see me, and he did so. I was removed to the hospital ship the next day.

Where did you last see Mr. Wilde?—At the St.

James's Theatre when he came forward at the end of a play.

When did you first know the gentleman whom you saw in Paris?—Early in 1892.

Had the gentleman promised to take you to Paris before you met Mr. Wilde?—Yes.

And he could not go at the appointed time?—No.

So Mr. Wilde took you instead?—Yes.

Are you sure you came back from Paris with Mr. Wilde?—Yes.

Witness denied that in Paris he had been guilty of any impropriety with anyone. At Osnaburgh Street he lived with a man of fifty named Burton. He had lived with him about three years at 124, Tachbrook Street, Pimlico, and at other places. Burton was a bookmaker, and witness acted as his clerk when he went to races. Witness had appeared also at music-halls.

Sir Edward Clarke:—Have you also been engaged in the business of blackmailing?—I don't remember.

Think.—I never got money in that way.

Has Burton not obtained money from persons on the ground that they have committed indecent acts of a criminal nature with you?—No, sir.

Have you ever gone out into the streets in woman's dress?—No. (Here the witness laughed.) I swear I have not.

Witness added that not to his knowledge had Burton ever blackmailed any one by threatening to make disgraceful charges.

Sir Edward Clarke then wrote down a name on a piece of paper. The witness swore that

he had never seen or heard the name before.

Sir Edward Clarke:—What names have you gone by?—I have a professional name, Denny.

Has Burton obtained money from persons?—No.

Do you know that name? (handing witness a slip of paper)—No.

Do you know anything about a Birmingham gentleman?—No.

Where were you living on June 9th, 1891?—In Lennox Gardens, Chelsea.

On that date did a Birmingham gentleman come with you to the rooms you were living at, and did Burton come in, and did you and he get a large sum of money from that gentleman?—Certainly not; nothing of the kind ever took place.

In June, 1891, did Dennis or Burton take rooms for you in Tachbrook Street?—Yes, and lived with me there.

Do you swear that you never took the gentleman, whose name I wrote down, home with you from the Criterion? Did you take people there?—Only friends for a game of cards.

Give me the names of two or three of the people you have taken home to Tachbrook Street.—I cannot. I forget them.

Did you not take this gentleman's watch and chain and give them to Burton?—No.

Were you and Burton ever taken to Rochester Row police station?—No.

Not Burton?—Not that I know of.

Did you take the gentleman home? Did Burton come in and threaten him? Did you take the gentle-

man's watch and chain? And were you taken to the police station the following night, and did you there and then give up the watch and chain?—No, never.

Where does Burton live now?—I don't think he lives anywhere now. I haven't seen him for six months.

Did you, dressed as a woman, take a gentleman home with you to 35, Alderney Street, Pimlico, in August, 1892?—No. I never dressed as a woman in my life.

Did not that gentleman give Burton a cheque for £200 made out in the name of "St. Denis," which he supposed to be your name?—I swear the thing never happened.

Have you ever been to the Hotel Victoria in Northumberland Avenue?—I have never been inside it.

About two years ago, did not you and somebody else go there with two American gentlemen?—I never did.

And did Burton appear there and extort a large sum of money out of those gentlemen?—I have never been there.

Do you know Anderton's Hotel in Fleet Street?—I have never been there.

When did you go abroad with Burton?—I think in February, 1892.

When did you last go abroad with him?—Last spring.

How long were you away?—About a month.

Where did you stay?—At Gaze's Hotel, Nice. We went to Monte Carlo one afternoon.

What were you and Burton doing at Nice?—Having a holiday.

You and Burton fell out, didn't you?—No.

Was there no dispute there?—No.

How came you to separate this old-established connection, then?—I gave up being a bookmaker's clerk.

What name did he use in the betting ring?—Watson.

Did you blackmail a gentleman at Nice?—No.

Are you sure there was no quarrel between you and Burton at Nice?—There may have been a little row; I don't remember.

• Cross-examined by Mr. Grain:—Did you go to Scarborough about a year ago?—Yes.

Did Burton go with you?—Yes.

What was your business there?—I sang at the Aquarium.

Did you make the acquaintance of a count there? (Counsel handed witness the name on a piece of paper.)—I heard his name mentioned.

Did you ever speak to him?—No. I heard other young men speak of him. He had a big yacht lying out in the bay.

Now, I put it to you, did not you and Burton obtain money from that nobleman to the amount of nearly £500?—No.

Had you an engagement at the Scarborough Aquarium?—Yes.

How much a week?—£4 10s.

How long were you there?—Three weeks.

Have you ever lived in the Buckingham Palace Road?—Yes.

Then look at the name on that piece of paper, please. Do you know the name?—No; I never saw it before.

When were you living in Buckingham Palace Road?—In 1892.

Do you remember being introduced to an elderly man in the city?—No.

Did you take him to your room and rob him of his pocket-book?—No.

Did you threaten to extort money from him?—No.

Did you or Burton afterwards go to the gentleman's office and threaten to expose the contents of the pocket-book unless you received a large sum of money?—No.

Did you ever go to a place in the suburbs, on the South-Western line, with Burton?—No.

Did you ever meet a man named Driver?—Yes, on the racecourse. He was a mere acquaintance. He never accompanied me on any of my singing tours.

What other addresses have you had in London during the last three years?—None but those I have mentioned.

The prisoners had followed this cross-examination with close attention. Taylor showed some excitement, but Wilde, lolling wearily in the corner of the dock with his head on his hands, was inscrutable. When the witness Atkins left the box, Taylor looked round the court with a bold stare, seeming specially

anxious to explore the dark corners of the gallery.

EVIDENCE OF MARY APPLEGATE

Mary Applegate, formerly servant and now house-keeper at 28, Osnaburgh Street, Regent's Park, N.W., said she remembered Atkins lodging there. He left about a month ago. Mr. Wilde had visited the house twice. He used to come about five in the afternoon and leave at seven. Both visits were in the same week.

EVIDENCE OF SIDNEY MAVOR

Sidney Arthur Mavor, of 66, St. Helen's Gardens, North Kensington, being sworn, was examined for the prosecution on the strength of a statement he is alleged to have made to Lord Queensberry's solicitors. He stated that he was "something in the city," in partnership with a friend. In 1892 he met Taylor, who introduced himself at a theatre one evening when he (witness) was with a friend. Afterwards Taylor asked him to go to Little College Street, and he went to afternoon tea. He went to tea a dozen times, perhaps, and he had slept there with Taylor. He was introduced by Taylor to different people. At a dinner at a restaurant he had been introduced to Mr. Wilde. It was at Kettner's. The party consisted of Wilde, Taylor, and Schwabe; and he himself took Lord Alfred Douglas. Shortly afterwards he received a silver cigarette case with his Christian name scratched inside it. It was quite a surprise.

The case was produced. It was a smaller one than most of those which had been produced hitherto. The inscription in it was, "Sidney from O. W. October 1892." The Judge looked at it, and inquired how the "scratching" was done.* It was then passed round the jury-box, each jurymen examining it apparently with the acutest interest.

Witness, continuing his evidence, said that in consequence of a letter he received from Mr. Wilde, he went to see him at the Albemarle Hotel, in Piccadilly, and stayed the night. He had met Mr. Wilde several times in the meantime at tea in Little College Street. He arrived at the hotel soon after eight, and they had supper in a private sitting-room with two bedrooms leading out of it. He and Mr. Wilde called each other Oscar and Sidney. He was never called by any nickname, and did not know he had one. He denied that any misconduct occurred on the day he stayed at the hotel. He met Mr. Wilde at Taylor's again afterwards. At the time he went to the hotel he was out of employment. After he saw Mr. Russell, the solicitor, on March 30th, he did not visit Taylor, nor did he receive a letter from Taylor.

Mr. Gill:—Had you seen Wilde at Taylor's place in the afternoon before you went to the Albemarle?—No.

After you saw Wilde at the Albemarle did you see him again?—Yes, two or three times.

* "It is a very ungentlemanly thing to read a private cigarette case."

—*The Importance of Being Earnest*, Act i.

Cross-examined by Sir Edward Clarke:—No impropriety had ever taken place, and Mr. Wilde had never given him any money. He was always glad of Mr. Wilde's friendship.

Was the gentleman who gave the dinner of some social position?—Yes.

Cross-examined by Mr. Grain, witness said that two sums of money he had received from Taylor were in repayment of loans.

Re-examined by Mr. Gill:—The gentleman who gave the dinner was a young man, was he not?—Yes.

Was the first meeting between Taylor and Wilde at that dinner?—So I understood.

EVIDENCE OF EDWARD SHELLEY

Edward Shelley said that in 1891 he was clerk to Messrs. Elkin Mathews and John Lane, of the Bodley Head, Vigo Street, W. In 1892 they were publishing a book for Mr. Wilde. At the beginning of that year he dined with Mr. Wilde in a public room at the Albemarle Hotel. He had champagne with his dinner, and afterwards had whisky and soda and smoked cigarettes in Mr. Wilde's sitting-room.

Asked what happened afterwards, witness said that he did not like to say, and suggested that his depositions should be read over.

Continuing, witness said:—Mr. Wilde's conversation was principally about books and myself. Mr. Wilde said, "Will you come into my bedroom?" I did not know what he meant. As I went into the room Mr. Wilde kissed me. I got into bed, and

Mr. Wilde undressed and did the same. He was in the bed with me all night.

Witness here described certain acts of indecency which he alleged to have occurred, and added, "I had been taking a lot of wine." Mr. Wilde saw him the next day, and again kissed him, witness stated, and "there was a repetition of the previous night's performance." Wilde also invited witness to go with him to Brighton, to Paris, and to Cromer, but he did not go. He had given him a set of his writings, including "Dorian Gray." Mr. Wilde had written in the books, but witness had torn out the inscriptions. He had done that quite recently, since he heard of the charges suggested by Lord Queensberry. He had also received letters from Mr. Wilde, which he had kept till about a couple of years ago; and at the same time he wrote to Mr. Wilde a letter in which he said that he could not have anything more to do with a man of his morality, and he broke off the acquaintance, witness saying that he would not see Mr. Wilde again.

The Judge asked whether this letter could be produced, and as it was not forthcoming, he doubted whether he could take the letter as evidence.

The Court adjourned for half an hour at this point for luncheon.

On taking his seat after the adjournment, the Judge consented, at the request of Sir Edward Clarke, to adjourn the case at four o'clock that afternoon till the following Monday morning.

Before the examination of Shelley was proceeded with,

Inspector Richards was put in the box. He said that he had served upon the prisoners in Holloway notice to produce certain specified documents.

Edward Shelley was then called again. In answer to Mr. Avory, he said that he had sent by post the letter breaking off his acquaintance with Mr. Wilde. He had received no answer to that letter.

CROSS-EXAMINATION OF EDWARD SHELLEY

Cross-examined by Sir Edward Clarke, Shelley said that he wrote to Mr. Wilde, in the spring of 1893, a letter, in which he said, "I have suffered more from my acquaintance with you than you are ever likely to know." I further said that he was an immoral man and that I would never see him again. I began the letter "Sir."

Sir Edward Clarke:—If such a thing as you allege happened, you must have resented the outrage upon you?—Yes, I did.

Then why did you go and dine with him the very next day?—Because I was a young fool, I suppose.

Being further pressed, witness was sure that he had not made any mistake with reference to what had occurred between himself and Mr. Oscar Wilde.

Sir Edward Clarke: Did it occur to you that it was a sin after the second occasion?—Yes, it did occur to me that it was a sin I was committing.

Did you become familiar with some of Mr. Wilde's writings?—Yes.

And did you talk to him upon literary subjects?—Yes, before I went to the Albemarle Hotel.

Did your relations with Mr. Wilde remain unbroken until you wrote that letter in March, 1893?—Yes.

Have you seen Mr. Wilde since then?—Yes, I went to see him at Tite Street.

Some discussion then took place relative to the admission in evidence of the transcript of the short-hand notes taken in the case of *Regina v. Queensberry*. The difficulty was overcome by Mr. C. F. Gill consenting to Sir Edward Clarke reading what portion of the note he wished relative to the evidence of Mr. Oscar Wilde at that trial with reference to certain letters of the witness to Wilde. Sir Edward Clarke read one in which Shelley expressed his admiration of a new play, which had just been produced, of which Wilde was the author, and stated his intention to invite Wilde to dine with him. Some time later, after the commission of the alleged acts, he was writing, “Dear Oscar . . . I can never forget your kindness, and am conscious that I can never sufficiently express my thankfulness to you,” etc.

Sir Edward Clarke:—Was it present in your mind at the time you wrote this that Mr. Wilde had insulted you when you had had too much to drink?—Certainly, I could not forget such a thing.

Were you under the painful sense of having committed sin?—I tried to forget it. I wanted to think some good of the man.

Pressed further, witness said that he condoned the first misconduct because he thought the fact that Mr. Wilde had had too much to drink accounted for his conduct. He could not, however, swear that this was

the thought in his mind. He thought that Mr. Wilde was sorry for what had happened, and so witness forgave him. In another letter which Shelley had sent to Wilde he related how he had had a frightful interview with his father, and as to how his parents accused him of idleness, and that he was "sick and tired in body and soul of his harsh existence."

In another communication Shelley implored Wilde to assist him, adding, "I am trying to lead a Christian life, and I will accept poverty as part of the Christian religion."

Sir Edward Clarke :—These letters were written to one whom you thought an immoral man?—Yes.

The witness was in monetary difficulties which Mr. Lane, his employer, was willing to relieve by a gift. But Shelley said that he "rather disliked" Mr. Lane, who had tried to save him from association with Wilde, and declined his assistance. "It began to be known," added witness, "that I was friendly with Mr. Wilde, and my employers suffered a good deal of annoyance through being chaffed about it, and I resigned to put an end to an unpleasant position." The witness's father was so much annoyed at the friendship that he ordered him to leave the house; but this difference was made up again. Shelley went to work in the city at a salary of £50 a year, and found it so insufficient that he wrote further letters to Wilde begging for help and declaring that he could accept nothing from "that viper John Lane." In another letter to Wilde which Counsel read, Shelley, referring to his late employer, Mr. John Lane, said "I detest him."

"Were you in your sound mind when you wrote that?" Sir Edward Clarke asked the witness, and Shelley jumping at the explanation said that he thought his mind must have been disordered. He could not remember any reason for calling Mr. Lane a viper. The only explanation he could give was that his mind had been overstrained through hard study.

Sir Edward Clarke then read a number of other letters couched in a pleading and religious strain—which the witness Shelley had written to Wilde. In one of them occurred the sentence, "I am afraid sometimes I am not very sane."

Witness said he was unwell at the time he wrote those letters.

Sir Edward Clarke:—You mean that your head was untrustworthy?—Yes.

When did your mind entirely recover itself—if it has done so?—In October or November last year.

In January last were you arrested for assaulting your father?—Yes.

Did your father tell you to leave his house?—Yes. It was because of my friendship for Mr. Wilde.

Did your parents accuse you of idleness?—Yes, they thought me idle.

Were you quite in your sound mind when you assaulted your father?—No, I couldn't have been.

Shelley further stated that he sent to Mr. Wilde for bail, and the case was eventually dismissed, the charge being withdrawn by his father.

FREDERICK ATKINS RECALLED

At the request of Sir Edward Clarke, the witness

Frederick Atkins was recalled, and the learned Counsel proceeded to entoil him in a mesh of contradictions which must have had its effect in determining the reliability of the testimony given by this witness and others of his kind.

During the luncheon interval, Mr. Robert Humphreys, Wilde's solicitor, had been busy searching the records at Scotland Yard and Rochester Row police station, and had made some important discoveries. A folded document was handed up to the Judge. Mr. Justice Charles read it, and at once assumed a very stern expression. The document was a copy of a record from Rochester Row.

Sir Edward Clarke:—Now, I warn you. I'm going to ask you a question. Think before you reply.

The Judge:—Just be careful, now.

Sir Edward Clarke:—On June 10th, 1891, were you living at Tachbrook Street, Pimlico?—Yes.

James Dennis Burton was living there with you?—Yes.

Were you both taken by two constables—396A and 500A—you've probably forgotten their numbers—to Rochester Row police station and charged with demanding money from a gentleman with menaces?—I was not charged with that. (The witness murmured this answer in a husky voice).

Were you taken to the police station?—Yes.

You and Burton?—Yes.

What were you charged with?—With hitting a gentleman.

In what place was it alleged you had hit him?—At the card table.

In your room at Tachbrook Street?—Yes.

After consultation with his junior, Mr. Charles Mathews, Sir Edward Clarke continued:—What was the gentleman's name?—I don't know.

How long had you known him?—That night.

Where had you met him?—At the Alhambra.

Had you seen him before that time?—Not to speak to.

Meeting you at the Alhambra, did he go with you to Tachbrook Street?—Yes; to play cards.

Was Burton at home?—Yes.

Any one else there?—I don't think so.

Eh?—No.

Was the gentleman sober?—Yes.

Sure of it?—Yes.

What room did you go into?—Sitting-room.

Who called the police?—I don't know. I believe, the landlady.

Did the landlady give you and Burton into custody?—Nobody did.

Who did?—I did not hear anybody.

You were taken to Rochester Row, and the gentleman went with you?—Yes.

Police-Constable 396A was here called into court in sight of Atkins.

Sir Edward Clarke:—Now, I ask you, in this constable's presence, was the statement made at the police station that you and the gentleman had been in bed together?—I don't think so.

You may as well tell us all about it, you know. Was that statement made?—Yes, it was.

The gentleman declined to prosecute, and so you and Burton were liberated?—Yes.

Sir Edward concluded. His last question brought a characteristic reply.

About two hours ago, Atkins, I asked you these very questions, and you swore upon your oath that you had not been in custody at all, and had never been taken to Rochester Row. How came you to tell me those lies?—I did not remember it.

“Leave the box,” said the Judge sternly, and the perjured witness left the court abashed.

CONCLUSION OF THE DAY'S EVIDENCE

• Evidence was given by Mr. Mathews of the firm of Elkin Mathews and John Lane, that it was brought to his knowledge that Mr. Wilde was communicating with Shelley.

Mr. Aloys Vogel, proprietor of the Albemarle Hotel, stated that he took steps to lose Mr. Wilde's custom after learning the character of his visitors.

Evidence of a formal character was given by a silversmith as to the supply of silver cigarette cases and the purchase of other small articles by Mr. Oscar Wilde at Thornhill's in New Bond Street.

Charles Robinson, a bookkeeper at the Savoy Hotel, gave formal evidence as to the apartments occupied by Mr. Oscar Wilde.

At this stage the trial was adjourned until the following Monday morning.

xii.—THE THIRD DAY OF THE TRIAL

Monday, April 29th, was the third day of the trial. When the accused men were brought in it was noticed that they appeared to have profited considerably by their Sunday rest in Holloway Gaol. Wilde was evidently less distraught than on the previous Saturday; his face was not so pinched and had recovered to some extent from the pallor it exhibited on that occasion. Taylor seemed to be positively exuberant, and took a seat in the dock with the air of one who had no concern in the proceedings beyond that of listener. As on the Saturday, the court was full, but not overcrowded. Wilde handed two notes to the usher, which were passed on to his Counsel.

When Mr. Justice Charles had taken his seat on the bench, Mr. Grain, addressing him, said that he did not know whether his lordship had on his notes with regard to the witness Shelley that the latter stated that Taylor was a stranger to him. The question was put to Shelley at the police court, but not, Counsel believed, at the trial.

Mr. Gill:—Certainly there is no evidence that the prisoner Taylor ever knew Shelley.

The Judge:—I ought not strictly to add it, because it has not been sworn to here. But did he say so before the magistrate?

Mr. Grain:—He did, my lord.

The Judge :—Very well.

The Foreman of the jury intimated that that was quite the impression of the jury.

The learned Judge then quoted from his notes of Shelley's evidence: " Taylor is quite a stranger to me."

John William Lehmann and Ebenezer Howard, two shorthand writers, were called to produce the notes of the Queensberry trial.

EVIDENCE OF VARIOUS WITNESSES

Antonio Migge, a masseur, Jane Cotter, a chamber-maid, and Mrs. Perkins, formerly housekeeper at the Savoy Hotel, repeated the evidence which they had previously given at the police court proceedings as to Wilde's stay at the hotel.

Migge said that in March, 1893, Wilde was staying at the Savoy Hotel, and witness occasionally massaged him at that time. One morning, between March 16th and March 20th, he called and went into Mr. Wilde's bedroom. He saw someone in bed. He at first thought it was a young lady, but afterwards he saw that it was a young man.

Cross-examined by Sir Edward Clarke:—You had gone to the room at the usual time for massage, had you not?—Yes.

And when you opened the door Mr. Wilde was dressing?—Yes.

In what part of the room was he?—At the wash-stand.

Jane Cotter spoke of Wilde staying at the hotel

in March of that same year. She deposed to seeing a boy in Wilde's room on a certain occasion. Wilde had two bedrooms adjoining. Wilde occupied No. 362 and Lord Alfred Douglas had the other one, No. 361.

Mrs. Perkins said that the previous witness made complaints to her about the state of Wilde's bedroom.

William Harris, a detective-sergeant, who obtained access by a subterfuge to Taylor's rooms at 13, Little College Street, in May, 1893, described the interior of the draped and artificially-lighted rooms. It was this officer who arrested Taylor on the present charge.

Taylor's rooms were darkened, he said; muslin was stretched across the windows; the walls and the ceiling were draped with muslin, and hung with fans and ornaments. There was no bedstead, but there was a mattress on the floor. The place was scented. On the morning of April 6th he saw Taylor leaving a house in Denbigh Place, Pimlico, and arrested him, saying that he had a warrant. Taylor replied, "Very well. I expected you last night. What are you going to do with me?" Witness said, "You will be taken to Bow Street, where the warrant will be explained to you, and you will go before the magistrate." He took Taylor to Bow Street. Upon him he found a subpoena in the case of the Queen and Queensberry.

Mr. Grain's cross-examination suggested that Taylor had heard that a warrant was out against him and was on his way to give himself up.

Was Taylor in attendance during the trial of the

case of the Queen against Queensberry?—I have heard so.

Counsel was then anxious to show that the darkening of Taylor's windows was only the drapery usual in Continental cities and in modern flats. The witness said he could express no opinion about Continental cities, but he had never seen anything of the kind in England. The muslin was not made into blinds, but was tightly stretched over the whole of the windows.

Detective-Inspector Richards described again the arrest of Mr. Oscar Wilde at the Cadogan Hotel in Sloane Street on the evening of April 5th, after the collapse of the case against Lord Queensberry. He said, "Mr. Wilde, we are police officers and hold a warrant for your arrest." Wilde replied, "Yes. Where shall I be taken?" "To Scotland Yard and then to Bow Street," witness answered. "Can I have bail?" asked Wilde. "No, I don't think you can," rejoined the police officer. On the following day, April 6th, witness went and searched Taylor's rooms. There he found, among other things, a gold brooch and several pairs of trousers of curious make.

Detective-Inspector Brockwell proved receiving the prisoner Wilde into custody at Scotland Yard and conveying him to Bow Street, where he was searched. Wilde wanted to read the warrant, and said, "Let me read it," but the inspector refused with the remark, "I cannot do that. If there is anything you cannot understand I will read it to you again." When the warrant was read to Taylor, he said, "Is that the only charge?"

Among other things found upon Wilde was a slip of paper in Taylor's handwriting. It was addressed to Sidney Mavor, Esq., and the contents of the note have already been given. There was found upon him also a letter from Taylor stating that he had left this note at his rooms for Sidney Mavor in case the latter should call, but that on arriving home he found that a police officer had called and had been admitted for the purpose of writing a letter. His (Taylor's) letter to Sidney Mavor had been opened and a note had been left stating that Inspector Littlechild wanted to see him, and would look out for him at the Old Bailey on the following morning. The note was left on April 4th.

In cross-examination the police witnesses admitted that Taylor was in attendance at the Old Bailey during the hearing of the Queensberry case. Inspector Littlechild was Lord Queensberry's agent.

Mr. Gill next read the papers found in Taylor's hat-box at Chapel Street, Chelsea. Most of them have already been referred to. Among the new ones was a New Year's card from Sidney Mavor to Alfred Taylor, on which the following lines were inscribed :

Always a bob in your pocket to spend ;
Always a good and a trusty friend ;
Wishing you these I add one more :
A happy and prosperous 'ninety-four.

Sir Edward Clarke :—There was a document found on Mr. Wilde when he was arrested which I should like to have read.

Mr. Gill :—Several letters were found upon the

prisoner Wilde which, subject to your lordship's views, I submit have nothing to do with this case. If your lordship will look at the letter, and thinks it desirable that it should be read, I will not press my objection.

Sir Edward Clarke :—I will hand your lordship a copy of the letter. All that I suggest is that certain letters have been referred to, and the possible inference to be drawn from these letters is, of course, a matter which your lordship appreciates. If your lordship will look at this letter, which was found upon Mr. Wilde, I think you will say it is only fair that I should be allowed to read it.

The Judge (after inspecting the letter) :—It amounts, Sir Edward, to a sympathetic letter from a friend of the defendant, written to him. I do not quite see what bearing it has upon this matter.

Sir Edward Clarke :—Simply this, my lord. The inference that is to be drawn in any cases from the contents of documents found upon persons charged is a difficult thing to define. It varies in different cases. My view is that as certain other documents and letters found upon Mr. Wilde have been put in for the purpose, no doubt, of producing some impression relevant to the question on the minds of the jury, I ought to be allowed to read, for the same purpose, another letter found upon him at the time. I will, however, defer to your lordship's opinion about it.

The Judge :—It comes to absolutely nothing. Supposing a letter had been found upon him written in a contrary sense by a person taking a different view, you might say it would be very wrong to read

it to the jury, because it might prejudice them.

Sir Edward Clarke :—I quite appreciate your lordship's point, and if you think my request unreasonable I will not insist.

The Judge :—I must leave it to Mr. Gill. I do not feel myself called upon to invite him to put it in.

Sir Edward Clarke :—I will not call upon my learned friend to read it on the ground that I have a grievance.

The Judge :—It will be sufficient, probably, that I have made the statement that it is a letter from a sympathetic friend.

Sir Edward Clarke :—A distinguished man of letters.*

The Judge :—A letter from a literary friend, and I think it is right I should say that in it he expresses the strongest feeling as to the charges under which the defendant Wilde is living.

The matter then dropped, and his lordship inquired whether there was any one present to prove that the prisoner Taylor was in attendance during the trial of Lord Queensberry.

Mr. Gill :—I think Kearley can prove that his attendance was secured here.

The Judge :—Then the jury may take it that Taylor was subpoenaed and was in attendance on the days named.

Mr. Gill :—He was certainly in the neighbourhood of the court.

Henry Read, Clerk of Arraigns, formally proved the documents in the charge of libel against the

* Robert Buchanan.

Marquis of Queensberry. He added that the jury returned a verdict of Not Guilty against the Marquis.

READING EVIDENCE GIVEN AT THE PREVIOUS TRIAL

Mr. Gill intimated that he did not intend to call any more witnesses. .

The Judge :—Of course, Mr. Gill, you know that up to the present I have not had the examination, cross-examination, and re-examination of the defendant Wilde in the former trial.

Mr. Gill :—No, my lord.

The Judge :—Do not think that I consider you in any way bound to put that in. You are not bound, assuredly, to call all the evidence you adduced before the magistrate, but I understood you to say on Friday that you desired to take the course I have suggested.

Mr. Gill :—Sir Edward Clarke having expressed a wish that the evidence of Mr. Wilde should be read, I consented to the whole of it being put in—examination, cross-examination, and re-examination; but, of course, I could not consent to any selected portions being read.

Sir Edward Clarke :—The whole of it being read will meet with no objection on my part, but I would suggest for your consideration that it is clear that there is a great deal in that evidence which has nothing whatever to do with the case, especially with regard to literary discussion and with reference to persons whose names have never been mentioned in this case. I submit this point for my learned friend's considera-

tion. Of course, I was then appearing for the prosecution, Mr. Wilde being the prosecutor, and the whole of his evidence in chief had no reference whatever to matters which are now in issue before the jury, because I had not entered into the question of the plea of justification which was brought out in the cross-examination of Mr. Wilde, so that the whole of the statements made by him with regard to any matters now before the jury, and relevant to this case, were made in answer to his cross-examination. However, if desired, the whole of it can be read; but it will very soon be seen that it has reference to matters of literary controversy and criticism with which I do not think we have anything whatever to do.

It then became a question of reading to the jury the evidence of Oscar Wilde given by him at the trial of Lord Queensberry.

Sir Edward Clarke objected that only the cross-examination which foreshadowed Lord Queensberry's plea of justification had any bearing on the present charges which were in no way referred to in Mr. Wilde's examination in chief.

Mr. Gill held that the following questions and answers at the end of the examination in chief were pertinent, namely :

Q.—“ Your attention has been called to the statements which are made in the pleadings referring to different persons and impugning your conduct with them ? ”

A.—“ Yes.”

Q.—“ Is there any truth in any of these accusations ? ”

A.—“There is no truth whatever in any one of them.”

Mr. Gill (continuing):—My position with regard to this will, I think, be clearly understood by your lordship. At the end of his examination in chief, instead of being examined as to each particular charge in the plea of justification, Wilde was asked only these two questions.

The Judge:—Then what do you propose doing?

Mr. Gill:—Having put that denial in these general terms, I propose, my lord, to read to the jury the whole of the cross-examination which has a bearing on what the value of that denial is, because, of course, it is simply a denial, without the matter being gone into in any way. Therefore I propose to read the whole cross-examination, but not in reference to other persons, because I do not desire to introduce any matter which was outside the question at issue. At that time the question at issue was whether the prosecutor was such a person as described by the prisoner, and I wish to know what the value of the prosecutor's denial was by reading his cross-examination.

Sir Edward Clarke:—I am agreed, my lord, subject to the suggestion I have already made—that it will be found that the first thirty pages of the cross-examination have reference to literary subjects. However, if my learned friend insists upon reading that, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. Gill:—It is cross-examination on a question which is very important here.

Sir Edward Clarke:—I should not have thought that it was relevant; but my learned friend appears

to desire it, and your lordship will see what the character of that cross-examination is.

The whole of Mr. Oscar Wilde's cross-examination Mr. Gill proceeded to read to the jury who listened patiently through the hours of the long, close afternoon. The play of epigrams, which sparkled luridly even when their utterer was under the shadow of coming events and gave a psychological interest to so strange a case, had ceased to scintillate when repeated in the hard, dry legal tones of Mr. C. F. Gill and Mr. A. Gill, who read in turns.

Intolerably grim was the monotonous repetition of such maxims as "Art is rarely intelligible to the criminal classes," which had passed under the stenographer's pen and been hung to dry on the pothooks and hangers of the transcriber and now come again to their place of origin twisted by new circumstances into inversions of their former import.

At half-past two Mr. A. Gill reached his seventy-third folio, and Mr. C. F. Gill again took up the reading. Wilde's description of Taylor is worth recalling—"I do not call him an intimate friend. He was a friend of mine." When the reading came to the question of the relations between Wilde and Taylor, Mr. Grain rose to object that Mr. Wilde's cross-examination in another case should not be made evidence against his client.

Mr. Justice Charles said that he could not exclude it on that ground. It was evidence against Wilde, and that made it legal to read it. Whether it was also evidence against Taylor depended on considerations, which he would take care were not lost sight of.

The ordinary time for adjourning the day's proceedings arrived, and still the reading went drearily on. Mr. Horace Avory had taken the place of Mr. Gill, and his dry utterance did not come any nearer to recalling the sparkle of the original performance.

It was a welcome change when Sir Edward Clarke rose at a quarter-past four to begin his part of the weary business by reading the re-examination. And the court heard with gratitude his promise to make it as short as possible. Besides, Sir Edward Clarke read so very much better and had the opportunity of reading Wilde's letters to the "Scots Observer," referring to that journal's review of "Dorian Gray." In them Wilde wrote, "I do not suppose that the criminal and illiterate classes ever read anything except newspapers. They are certainly not likely to be able to understand anything of mine." And again, "As for the mob, I have no desire to be a popular novelist. It is far too easy."

Wilde appeared very listless during the reading of the evidence he had given at the former trial, but Taylor seemed somewhat amused on hearing some of the answers given by Wilde, when prosecutor, to the questions addressed to him. He smiled more than once.

CLOSE OF THE PROSECUTION

Shortly before five o'clock the last folio had been read, and Mr. C. F. Gill announced that the case for the prosecution was now closed.

Mr. Gill:—That is the case for the Crown, my lord.

The Judge:—I do not think it desirable to proceed any further this afternoon.

After the prisoners had left the dock, Sir Edward Clarke handed to the Judge a written statement of the objection which he had taken at the opening of the case to the charges under the Criminal Law Amendment Act and those of conspiracy against the accused being joined in one indictment. Sir Edward said that he had to ask that a case might be stated.

He also handed up a formal demurrer to his lordship's decision that the prisoners were properly called upon to plead to the conjoint counts of the indictment which charged them with

(i.) Conspiracy;

(ii.) Offences under the Criminal Law Amendment

Act of 1885, section xi., under which the accused could themselves be competent witnesses.

The difficulty was that if the accused offered their testimony under the second head, they practically laid themselves open to cross-examination under both. That the counts of the indictment had been misjoined in that way prejudiced the prisoners as to their right to give evidence, but Sir Edward professed his readiness to agree to the form which his lordship might think best for stating a case.

Mr. Justice Charles said he was under the impression that if there was anything substantial in the point it should be raised by a case stated for the Court of Crown Cases Reserved. He would, however, take

time to consider the matter, and promised to give his decision on the following morning.

Upon that decision the course to be taken by the defence to some extent depended. It was thought at the end of Monday's proceedings that Taylor would not in any circumstances be put in the witness-box, and it was not considered probable that Wilde would be called upon to give evidence.

Even if no witnesses were to be called for the defence, it was known that it would be impossible for any decision to be arrived at until late on the following day, and it was foreseen that there was a possibility of the case being carried on until Wednesday.

xiii.—THE FOURTH DAY—CONSPIRACY CHARGES WITHDRAWN

Mr. Justice Charles took his seat at eleven o'clock on Tuesday, April 30th, the fourth day of the trial. Contrary to general expectation, Counsel for the defence elected to put the accused into the box to give evidence on their own behalf, and this was only one of the sensations of the fourth day of this remarkable trial.

Another sensation was the withdrawal by the prosecution of the charges of conspiracy alleged against the accused, and Sir Edward Clarke said somewhat warmly that if this course had been adopted in the first instance, he should have applied for the accused to be tried separately. He admitted, however, that Mr. Gill had a perfect right to withdraw a count in the indictment at any time he liked. It was generally felt that the Crown was conscious of the weakness of its case, and hoped that by withdrawing charges which the prosecution foresaw it would be difficult to prove, it would strengthen the other charges brought against the accused.

It was after the subsidence of this sensation that Sir Edward Clarke announced his intention of putting his client, Mr. Oscar Wilde, into the witness-box. At the same time Counsel would protest once more against the reading on the previous day of Mr. Wilde's evidence in the libel action which he brought

against the Marquis of Queensberry. He wished, Sir Edward continued, to remind the jury that a man was better and higher than his books. Counsel declared, too, that "The Picture of Dorian Gray" was a very simple story; and "The Priest and the Acolyte" was a work against which Mr. Wilde had been one of the first to protest on its appearance in "The Chameleon." Sir Edward further pointed out that the latest date on which misconduct was alleged against Mr. Wilde was a year and a half ago; and that it was his client's own act in prosecuting Lord Queensberry which had brought the matter before the public and placed him in the position of peril in which he stood at that moment. Counsel referred also to the relations existing between Lord Queensberry and members of his family; but Mr. Gill protested that that matter was not relevant to the present proceedings.

Sir Edward Clarke went on to say that men who are guilty of the offences alleged against his client suffer from a sort of insanity and would shrink from a public inquiry. But Mr. Oscar Wilde had brought his case before the world, and would go into the witness-box to testify to his innocence.

Mr. Grain, on behalf of Alfred Taylor, said that he, too, would put his client into the witness-box to deny the truth of the allegations brought against him.

THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE CONSPIRACY CHARGES

On the Judge taking his seat on the bench,

Mr. C. F. Gill immediately rose and said:—My Lord, I have had an opportunity of considering the

indictment since the case for the prosecution was closed; and in consultation with my friends, Mr. Avory and Mr. Gill, I have come to the determination not to ask for a verdict on the counts of the indictment charging conspiracy. Of course, I do that having in my mind that no evidence has been given here at all which was not directly material to the other charges.

The announcement by Mr. Gill of this determination caused no little sensation, and expressions of surprise, more or less subdued, were heard in the public gallery.

Sir Edward Clarke said that if that had been done in the first instance he should have applied for the charges against the two prisoners to be heard separately; but of course Mr. Gill had a legal right to withdraw the counts at any stage of the case.

Mr. Justice Charles said that the evidence had suggested to his mind that the conspiracy charges were unnecessary.

Mr. Gill:—That was the conclusion arrived at after going through the evidence.

Sir Edward Clarke:—It is not a matter on which I have anything to say at the moment. Mr. Gill is entitled to say that he does not intend to ask the jury to say there is evidence before them on the charges of conspiracy, and I understand that to be the position.

Mr. Gill:—That is not exactly the position.

Sir Edward Clarke:—I do not want to be pertinacious, but I wish to know what is the position and whether my learned friend asks your lordship

now to strike out these counts from the indictment.

Mr. Gill :—I am taking the course of not asking for a verdict on these counts because it has been suggested that there would be a difficulty with regard to calling the prisoners by reason of these counts being in the indictment. For that reason I desired to take this course to avoid any difficulty being placed in the way of either of the prisoners, Wilde or Taylor, giving evidence.

Mr. Justice Charles :—You are entitled to take that course, Mr. Gill, and I understand you to say that you do not ask the jury to give a verdict of guilty upon the counts of conspiracy.

Sir Edward Clarke :—I ask that a verdict of the jury of “ Not Guilty ” shall be taken at once.

The Judge :—I cannot consent to that.

Sir Edward Clarke insisted that he must ask that such a verdict be taken at some time.

The Judge replied that all he would say at that moment was that he acceded to Mr. Gill’s application.

Sir Edward Clarke :—I shall claim a verdict of “ Not Guilty,” and I shall probably find it my duty later in the day to comment upon the course taken by the Crown.

The Judge :—Have you anything more to say, Sir Edward?

Sir Edward Clarke :—No, my lord; but I was about to address the jury.

It was, the learned Counsel observed, a very remarkable incident in a very remarkable trial. He intended to call Mr. Wilde, and his decision to do so had not been arrived at in consequence of the state-

ment just made by Mr. Gill. Those charges of conspiracy, if they were not to be proceeded with, ought not to have been put in the indictment. Counsel was aware that his putting his client into the box entitled Mr. Gill to the right of reply, and exposed him to the penalty of having the evidence commented upon; but he (Sir Edward) had never attached so much importance to the last word as some of the advocates who taught him his profession used to do. But after the reading on the previous day of the evidence in the Queensberry case, it became clear to him that he must call Mr. Wilde and allow him on his oath to deny the foul charges that had been made against him.

With regard to the literary part of the case, Counsel felt obliged to make some observations. Mr. Gill, in opening the case, had urged upon the jury that it was their duty to dismiss from their minds all that they had heard elsewhere. The case had been commented upon by a large section of the Press in a way that Sir Edward thought was disgraceful. Such comments were calculated to imperil the administration of justice, and it was in the highest degree injurious to the interests of his client. Nor did he think it quite fair of Mr. Gill to have insisted on reading Mr. Wilde's cross-examination upon his books and writings. It was not fair to judge a man even by his books; but the prosecution had gone further than that, and had sought to judge Mr. Wilde by books which he did not write and by an article which he had repudiated as horrible and disgusting. Coleridge said long ago, "Judge no man by his books: a man,

is better, higher than his books." There was a pretence for such conditions in the former trial, when the question was one as to whether Mr. Wilde was "posing" or not, but in the present case there was no such excuse. With regard to "The Picture of "Dorian Gray," it was a very simple story published in America in "Lippincott's Magazine"—one of the highest class productions of American periodical literature. It was afterwards published in England, when Mr. Wilde, yielding to the suggestion of one of the most accomplished critics of our age, Mr. Walter Pater, altered one particular passage that bore an unpleasant interpretation. It had since been in constant circulation and on sale in every English bookshop. And now the passage was read out in court to prove that Mr. Wilde was an immoral man. Briefly Sir Edward Clarke sketched the plot of "Dorian Gray" in words that recalled his eloquent passages in the former trial, describing the strong wish of Dorian Gray that his beauty should remain with him and that the effect of his sins—nowhere mentioned or described—should be visited upon the picture of himself; how a change takes place and how Dorian Gray, unable to bear the hideous secret any longer, stabs the picture, which once more returns to the smiling presentment of youth, while Dorian Gray falls dead, a horrible, wretched, old man. If the jury were a committee sitting to consider whether that book was to be approved, he would not have the smallest hesitation in defending it before them; and yet that book had been assailed in cross-examination with the view of showing that its author must be an

immoral man. Could, the learned Counsel asked, anything be more unfair? When cross-examination was directed for the purpose of biassing the minds of the jury, when they came to consider questions of fact and evidence, he (Sir Edward) did not hesitate to denounce the attempt as most unfair to Mr. Wilde, and as violating every canon of fairness that ought to be applied to justice. What was it Mr. Gill had had to warn the jury against? Partly, he contended, against the effect produced by cross-examination, upon which he asked them to exercise their firm and honest judgment as men who wanted to deal fairly by their fellows. With regard to the publication of "The Chameleon," Sir Edward pointed out that the defendant was not acquainted with the editor, an Oxford undergraduate, who wrote to Wilde, as a distinguished man of letters, to contribute something to its columns. Being busy at the time, Mr. Wilde sent what he called some "Phrases and Philosophies for the Use of the Young" which had been used in some of his plays and were of a paradoxical nature, and which, Counsel submitted, were innocent and harmless enough. In that publication Mr. Wilde had seen an article called "The Priest and the Acolyte," which was disgraceful; and Mr. Wilde was so indignant that he communicated with the editor on the subject, as he felt most insulted by having his name on the title-page of that publication. And yet, although he had stated on oath his disapproval of that article, Mr. Wilde was cross-examined on it, and it was sought to attach stigma to him in that connection. Faint and far off as was the justification

for the cross-examination with reference to "Dorian Gray," for that with reference to "The Priest and the Acolyte" there was no justification whatever. As to Mr. Carson's cross-examination of Wilde on the French work, "A Rebours," it was grossly unfair and a violent misadministration of every canon of justice.

Turning to another topic, the learned Counsel said that the defendant had been for some time a friend of Lady Queensberry and her sons. Now what sort of accusation was it that Mr. Wilde had to meet? It was Mr. Wilde's own act that had brought the matter to an issue. Lord Queensberry had been divorced by his wife.

Mr. Gill:—I submit that this is in no way material to the present case. Sir Edward had the opportunity at the last trial of saying everything that ought to have been said on the subject, and he consented to a verdict of acquittal being taken by the jury. I now protest, therefore, against any attack being made against Lord Queensberry, who is not present.

The Judge:—Were the letters which have been referred to put in in the examination?

Sir Edward Clarke:—Yes, my lord.

The Judge:—But they are not relevant.

Mr. Gill:—Certainly not.

Sir Edward Clarke:—My friend rebuking me for irrelevance is rather amusing.

Mr. Gill:—It is not intended to be.

Sir Edward Clarke explained that it was necessary to show how it was that Lord Queensberry was writing to members of his family, and that was why

he had mentioned the divorce. As long as those letters were written only to the family it was obvious why Mr. Wilde took no steps in the matter; but the moment Lord Queensberry left that objectionable card at his club, Mr. Wilde applied for a warrant and had the Marquis arrested.

Counsel further pointed out that the latest date on which misconduct was charged against Mr. Wilde was eighteen months ago; and that it was Wilde's own act in prosecuting Lord Queensberry that brought the matter before the public and placed him in his present position of peril.

He (Sir Edward Clarke), with the Counsel acting with him, was responsible for the advice given to Mr. Wilde in the Queensberry case; and it was partly owing to that fact that he was there again on Mr. Wilde's behalf to meet the accusation which could not be tried properly then. Men charged with the offences alleged against Mr. Wilde shrank from investigation, and Counsel submitted that the fact of Mr. Wilde taking the initiative of a public trial was evidence of his innocence.

Nor was that all. A few days before the first trial, notice was given of certain charges made against him, with names and dates. On March 30th Mr. Wilde knew the catalogue of accusations. Did the jury believe that had he been guilty he would have stayed in England and faced those accusations? Men guilty of such offences suffered from a species of insanity. What, then, would they think of a man who, knowing himself to be guilty, and that evidence would be forthcoming from half-a-dozen different places.

insisted on bringing his case before the world? Insane would hardly be the word for it if Mr. Wilde really had been guilty and yet faced that investigation.

The learned Counsel further maintained that a guilty man would have listened to the evidence called in support of the plea of justification before going, as Mr. Wilde did, frankly into the witness-box to answer the accusations preferred in the plea. Now he would have the advantage of being able to show that what Mr. Wilde would say that day in the witness-box he had stated at the previous trial before any evidence had been called against him. That was most significant, and he (Sir Edward) hoped that if any doubt remained in the minds of the jury as to whether it was possible for them to convict the defendant upon such evidence as they had heard, that doubt would be at once removed when they heard his denial upon oath of those charges.

Mr. Grain intimated that he would call his client, Mr. Alfred Taylor, when the time arrived, but he did not propose to make more than one speech to the jury.

EXAMINATION OF OSCAR WILDE

Sir Edward Clarke having called out the defendant's name, Mr. Oscar Wilde stepped lightly from the dock and walked erectly to the witness-box. There, leaning across the rail in the same easy attitude which he assumed when he was cross-examined by Mr. Carson in the libel action a few weeks previously, he quietly answered the questions addressed to him by Sir Edward Clarke, his leading Counsel.

In the first place Sir Edward dealt with Wilde's early career, and elicited from the witness details as to his successes at school and at Trinity College, Dublin, and his still more remarkable success achieved subsequently at Oxford. The brilliancy of his pen, as shown by his later career as author and dramatist, was also made clear. In 1884 he had married Miss Constance Lloyd, and from that time up to the present he had lived with her at 16, Tite Street, Chelsea. He had occupied also for a time some rooms at St. James's Place, which he took for the purpose of his literary work, it being quite out of the question for him to get quietude at his own house when his two young sons were at home. He had heard the evidence against himself in this case, and he declared that there was no truth in any one of the allegations of indecent behaviour.

Referring to the evidence given by Wilde during the recent libel action which he had brought against Lord Queensberry, Sir Edward Clarke said:—

Was the evidence that you gave on that occasion absolutely and in all respects true?

Witness:—Entirely true evidence.

Is there any truth in any of the allegations made against you in the evidence in this case?—There is no truth whatsoever in any one of the allegations; no truth whatsoever.

OSCAR WILDE CROSS-EXAMINED

Mr. C. F. Gill rose to cross-examine.

On the last occasion you were cross-examined with

reference to two letters written to Lord Alfred Douglas?—Yes.

One letter was handed up to the witness; the other was searched for. When it was found, Mr. Gill continued his cross-examination:—

You were asked as to those letters, as to "Dorian Gray," and as to "The Chameleon"?—Yes.

You said you had read Lord Alfred Douglas's poems in "The Chameleon"?—Yes.

Lord Alfred Douglas contributed two poems to "The Chameleon," and they were beautiful poems?—Yes.

Sir Edward Clarke:—I do not want to make any difficulty, but I understood from my learned friend that he was going to confine his cross-examination to the specific charges made here.

Mr. Gill:—This is cross-examination as to credit.

The Judge:—I do not see how I can interfere. Questions which the learned Counsel thinks should go to credit he is entitled to put.

Mr. Gill:—Listen, Mr. Wilde. I shall keep you only a very short time in the witness-box.

Counsel then proceeded to read one of the poems published in "The Chameleon," and having done so, asked:—Is that one of the beautiful poems?

Sir Edward Clarke:—That is not one of Mr. Wilde's.

Mr. Gill:—I am not aware that I said it was.

Sir Edward Clarke:—I thought you would be glad to say it was not.

The Judge:—I understand that was a poem by Lord Alfred Douglas.

Mr. Gill:—Yes, my lord, and one which the witness described as a beautiful poem.* The other beautiful poem is one that follows immediately and precedes “The Priest and the Acolyte.”

Continuing his cross-examination, the learned Counsel said to the witness:—

The first was “In Praise of Shame,” concluding with the words, “Of all sweet passions Shame is loveliest”? *

Witness:—May I——?

No! Kindly answer my questions.—Certainly.

The Judge:—If you have any explanation to add to your answer you may do so.

Witness:—I will merely say this, my lord. It is not for me to explain the work of anybody else. It does not belong to me. But the word “shame” used in that poem is a word used in the sense of “modesty.” I mean that I was anxious to point out that “Shame that turns cold lips”—I forget the line exactly—“to fire” is a quickened sense of modesty.*

Mr. Gill:—Your view, Mr. Wilde, is that the “shame” mentioned there is that shame which is a sense of modesty.

Witness:—That was the explanation given to me by the person who wrote it. The sonnet seemed to me obscure.

During 1893 and 1894 you were a good deal in the company of Lord Alfred Douglas?—Oh, yes.

Did he read that poem to you?—Yes.

*

“I am Shame
That walks with Love. I am most wise to turn
Cold lips and limbs to fire. . . .”

The next poem is one described as "Two Loves." It contains these lines :—

" 'Sweet youth,
Tell me why, sad and sighing, dost thou rove
These pleasant realms? I pray thee tell me sooth,
What is thy name?' He said, ' My name is Love.'
Then straight the first did turn himself to me,
And cried, ' He lieth, for his name is Shame.
But I am Love, and I was wont to be
Alone in this fair garden, till he came
Unasked by night; I am true Love, I fill
The hearts of boy and girl with mutual flame.'
Then sighing said the other, ' Have thy will,
I am the Love that dare not speak its name.' "

Was that poem explained to you?—I think that is clear.

There is no question as to what it means?—Most certainly not.

Is it not clear that the love described relates to natural love and unnatural love?—No.

What is the "Love that dare not speak its name"?—The "Love that dare not speak its name" in this century is such a great affection of an elder for a younger man as there was between David and Jonathan, such as Plato made the very basis of his philosophy, and such as you find in the sonnets of Michelangelo and Shakespeare. It is that deep, spiritual affection that is as pure as it is perfect. It dictates and pervades great works of art like those of Shakespeare and Michael Angelo, and those two letters of mine, such as they are. It is in this century misunderstood, so much misunderstood that

it may be described as the "Love that dare not speak its name," and on account of it I am placed where I am now. It is beautiful, it is fine, it is the noblest form of affection. There is nothing unnatural about it. It is intellectual, and it repeatedly exists between an elder and a younger man, when the elder man has intellect, and the younger man has all the joy, hope and glamour of life before him. That it should be so the world does not understand. The world mocks at it and sometimes puts one in the pillory for it.

Wilde's words created a sensation in court. As he stopped speaking there was loud applause, mingled with some hisses, in the public gallery of the court. Mr. Justice Charles at once said: "If there is the slightest manifestation of feeling I shall have the court cleared. There must be complete silence preserved." The speech of Wilde was declared by some to be "the finest speech of an accused man since that of Paul before Agrippa." It thrilled every one in the court. Mr. Robert Buchanan considered it "marvellous."

Mr. Gill:—Then there is no reason why it should be called "shame"?

Witness:—Ah, that, you will see, is the mockery of the other love—love which is jealous of friendship and says to it "You should not interfere."

You were staying at the Savoy Hotel with Lord Alfred Douglas at the beginning of March, 1893?—Yes.

And after that he went into rooms?—Yes.

I understand you to say that the evidence given in this case by the witnesses called in support of

the prosecution is absolutely untrue?—Entirely. Entirely untrue?—Yes.

Did you hear the evidence of the servants from the Savoy?—It is absolutely untrue.

Had you a quarrel with Lord Alfred Douglas in that week?—No; we never did quarrel—perhaps a little difference. Sometimes he said things that pained me and sometimes I said things that pained him.

Had he that week said unkind things?—I always make a point of forgetting whenever he says anything unkind.

Mr. Gill then read the letters written by Oscar Wilde to Lord Alfred Douglas. They had been produced and read in the Queensberry case. The first contained references to the "slim gilt soul" and the "red rose-leaf lips," and the second contained the words, "You are the divine thing I want," and described Lord Alfred Douglas's letter as being "delightful, red and yellow wine to me."

Mr. Gill sought to apply Wilde's definition of this misunderstood love to these two letters. Wilde answered: There is nothing in that of which I am ashamed. It is full of deep affection. The first letter was more of a prose poem, and the second more of a literary answer to a sonnet he had sent me.

Mr. Gill:—In reference to the incidents alleged against you at the Savoy Hotel, are you prepared to contradict the evidence of the hotel servants?

Witness:—It is entirely untrue. Can I answer for what hotel servants say years after I have left the hotel? It is childish. I am not responsible for hotel

servants. I have stayed at the hotel and been there constantly since.

There is no possibility of mistake? There was no woman with you?—Certainly not.

You had the opportunity of seeing the plea of justification in the Queensberry case, and you saw the different names?—Yes.

At the hearing of that case before Mr. Justice Henn Collins, except the hall porter and yourself no other witness was called?—No.

You had seen Taylor within a few days of the trial?—Yes.

He was not called?—No. He was subpoenaed by the other side. I knew that he was here.

And you knew that while the Counsel for Lord Queensberry was addressing the jury, the case was interrupted, a verdict of "Not Guilty" was agreed to, and the jury found that the justification was proved and the libel published for the public benefit?—I was not in court.

But you knew it?—No, I did not. I knew my Counsel had considered it would be impossible to get a verdict on the question as far as the literature went, and it was not for me to dispute their superior wisdom. I was not in court, nor have I read any account of that trial.

What is there untrue in the evidence of Shelley?—I say that his account of what happened is entirely untrue. It is true that he came to the Independent Theatre with me, but it was in a box with some friends. His accusations of impropriety are equally untrue.

Do you see no impropriety in kissing a boy?—In kissing a young boy, a child, of course not; but I certainly do not think that one should kiss a young man of eighteen.

Then as to Shelley's letters. There was a line in a later one which says, "God forgive the past; do your best for me now." Do you know the meaning of that?—Yes. Shelley was in the habit of writing me many morbid, very morbid, letters, which I tore up. In them he said that he was a great sinner and anxious to be in closer communion with religion. I always tore them up.

Charles Parker—what part of his evidence is untrue?—Where he says he came to the Savoy and that I committed acts of indecency with him. He never came to the Savoy with me to supper. It is true that he dined with me and that he came to St. James's Place to tea. The rest is untrue.

Anything else?—I do not know.

Then, Atkins—what do you say is not true?—It is not true when he says that he came into my room and saw me committing acts of indecency. The circumstances as to his going to Paris are wrong. It was true, however, that I met him at a dinner, met him again a day or two afterwards, and that within a few days more I went with him by the Club train to Paris; also that I gave him a cigarette case. Schwabe was, as Atkins said, in Paris, and it is true that Atkins slept in the room he described next to mine.

Did Atkins ever try to blackmail you?—Oh, no, never. I found him bright and amusing. I invited

him to go to Paris because I did not care to travel alone. He has given a grotesque and monstrous account of the dinner party at the London restaurant.

In fact, was not Atkins an agreeable companion?—He was amusing, pleasant. It was better than being alone.

And except that he says he saw Schwabe in bed with you, and that you wanted to get into his bed, his evidence is practically true?—Well, I say that his account of the dinner party and his description of how and why he met me were quite wrong. I was busy in Paris and left Schwabe and Atkins to go about together.

Who introduced you to Wood?—Lord Alfred Douglas.

Did you ever take Wood to Tite Street with you?—It is entirely untrue that he ever went to Tite Street with me at all.

Apart from the suggestions of indecency, Atkins's statements are, in the main, true?—Yes.

And the same remark applies to the evidence of Wood?—Yes.

You have no complaint to make in regard to Burton?—No, I do not know him.

Who introduced you to Taylor?—Mr. Schwabe.*

Why did you go to Taylor's rooms?—Because I used to meet actors and singers of many kinds there.

A rather curious establishment, wasn't it, Taylor's?—I didn't think so. I thought it Bohemian.

* This gentleman was a nephew of Sir Frank Lockwood, the Solicitor-General, who prosecuted for the Crown in the last trial.

Sir Edward Clarke:—Is this on the conspiracy, my lord?

Mr. Gill:—Those counts were withdrawn. This is cross-examination as to credit.

The Judge:—This evidence is relevant upon the points that remain?

Mr. Gill:—Certainly, my lord.

Cross-examination continued:—Did you notice that no one could see in through the windows?—No; that I didn't notice.

He burned incense, did he not?—Pastilles, I think.

Incense, I suggest?—I think not. Pastilles, I should say, in those little Japanese things that run along rods.

Did it strike you that this place was at all peculiar?—Not at all.

Not the sort of street you would usually visit in? You had no other friends there?—No; this was merely a bachelor's place.

Rather a rough neighbourhood?—That I don't know. I know it was near the Houses of Parliament.

What did you go there for?—To amuse myself sometimes; to smoke a cigarette; for music, singing, chatting, and nonsense of that kind, to while an hour away.

Why did you ask Sidney Mavor to stay all night with you at the Albemarle Hotel?—As company for me and a compliment to himself.

Did you know what he was?—No.

No occupation?—I don't know.

Wood?—No.

Parker?—No.

Scarfe?—No.

Taylor?—I understood he had private means.

You never saw anything to create suspicion?—No, And up to the last trial nothing had shaken your faith in Taylor?—Nothing.

After the case of Lord Queensberry was committed for trial, did you not see at Calais a boy named Tankard who used to be a page boy at the Savoy Hotel?—Oh, no.

Think!—Do you mean after the plea of justification was issued?

You were at Calais about that time?—Yes. I remember I saw Tankard. That was before the plea was put in.

Tankard was employed at the Calais' Hotel, and you were going abroad with Lord Alfred Douglas?—Yes.

Did you know last year of Taylor's arrest?—Yes. I saw that the charge was dismissed by the magistrate.

That satisfied you?—What satisfied me was that I did not see on what grounds the police went there at all.

I may take it, Mr. Wilde, that you see no reason why the police should keep observation at Little College Street?—No.

Cross-examined as to Alphonse Conway, whom he met on the beach at Worthing, Wilde said that he was such a happy, bright boy it was a pleasure to talk to him. He bought him a walking-stick and a suit of clothes and a hat with a bright ribbon, but witness was not responsible for the ribbon.

Mr. Gill:—With regard to your friendship towards

the persons I have mentioned, may I take it, Mr. Wilde, that it was, as you describe, the deep affection of an elder man for a younger?—Certainly not. One feels that once in one's life, and once only, towards anybody.

Sir Edward Clarke then briefly re-examined the witness. It was when passing through Calais, said Wilde, that he recognised the boy Tankard, who was door-keeper at the buffet of the hotel. He merely asked him how he was getting on, and the boy replied that he was learning French. At that time witness knew nothing of the plea of justification.

In answer to a further question, Wilde stated that he became aware at one time that Wood had some letters of his and he communicated with Sir George Lewis. Taylor arranged the meeting at his rooms.

Sir Edward Clarke:—Wood returned them?

Witness:—He gave me three letters back. They were not what I should call matters of great consequence, but no one likes to have his private letters read. They contained some slighting allusions to other people which I should not have liked made public. Then I received an anonymous letter saying that Wood had other letters, and intended to try and extort money by means of them. I did not give any money for them at all, but I gave Wood some money to enable him to go to America.

With reference to the two poems by Lord Alfred Douglas in "The Chameleon," the witness denied that he had had anything to do with their publication.

This concluded the witness's examination, and Wilde left the box. His demeanour had been

collected and impressive. He had certainly made a good impression. His appearance in the witness-box recalled some of the scenes in the trial of Lord Queensberry. He leaned over the rail of the box and answered, with all his former nonchalance, the questions put to him. Indeed, he acquitted himself with dignity, though it was clear that his enforced confinement was beginning to tell on his health. When in the dock, however, his attitude was, as on previous days, one of anxious attention.

It has been mentioned that his explanation of his letters to Lord Alfred Douglas, and his summary of modes of Platonic love, were received with direct expressions of approval and sympathy by spectators in the court, and the general applause was checked only by the stern reproof of the Judge.

EXAMINATION OF ALFRED TAYLOR

Alfred Taylor, being called by Mr. Grain, and sworn, said he was thirty-three years of age. He was the son of a cocoa manufacturer, whose business was now being carried on as a limited liability company.

Up to the age of sixteen or seventeen he was educated at Marlborough School, and afterwards he went to a private tutor at Preston, near Brighton. He then entered the Militia, going into the 4th Battalion of the Royal Fusiliers, City of London Regiment. His original intention was to go on into the Army, but on coming of age in 1883 he came

into a fortune of £45,000, and had since that time had no occupation, but had lived a life of pleasure. His father died in 1874, and his uncle in 1883.

On the charges of misconduct, alleged against him by the several witnesses, being put to him, one by one, he denied the truth of each one as "Certainly not true," and "Absolutely untrue."

Cross-examined by Mr. C. F. Gill:—He had no occupation. It was true that he used to have a number of young men living in his rooms and sleeping in the same bed.

Was it true that you ever went through a mock marriage with Mason?—Absolutely untrue.

Had you a woman's dress in your rooms?—An Eastern costume.

A woman's dress?—Yes.

A woman's wig?—I will explain. It was—

A wig?—Yes.

Had you women's stockings?—Yes.

At the time you were living in Chapel Street, were you in serious money difficulties?—I had just gone through the Bankruptcy Court.

You made the acquaintance of the Parkers in the St. James's Restaurant?—It was outside, and I was introduced to them by a friend.

What did you give them your address for?—Well, when one makes an acquaintance and you think you will like one another—

Are you in the habit of speaking to young men in Piccadilly?—I know what you mean. No.

You go into Piccadilly?—Yes, always.

St. James's?—Yes.

Have you ever accosted men at the Alhambra or the Empire?—Never.

Did you know Mr. Wilde well?—Yes.

Did you tell certain lads that he was fond of boys?—No, never.

Do you know that he is?—I believe he is fond of young people.

Witness added that he had introduced Charles Parker to Mr. Wilde because he thought the latter might use his influence to obtain for him some work on the stage.

Asked if he knew a man named Marling who was concerned in the Fitzroy Street raid, Taylor said “Yes.”

Do you know what he is?—I have heard a good deal.

Witness did not deny that he and Charles Parker were both arrested in that raid, but they were discharged from custody. The dinner at Kettner’s was in honour of his birthday. After dinner was over, the Parkers and himself all went home to his rooms in Little College Street. He burned incense in his rooms because he “liked it.”

Re-examined by Mr. Grain:—It was an Oriental dress he had to go to a fancy dress ball at Covent Garden. It came from Constantinople, and he bought it from a lady.

Taylor described with every appearance of candour the way he made the acquaintance of the various lads who had given evidence in the case against him, and the tea parties at Little College Street were harmless enough, according to his story. The cross-examina-

tion did not materially advance the case or evoke any kind of damaging admission.

At this point the court adjourned for luncheon.

SIR EDWARD CLARKE'S SPEECH FOR THE DEFENCE

Immediately after the interval for luncheon Sir Edward Clarke rose to address the jury on behalf of Mr. Oscar Wilde. •Rapidly the court filled up, until it was densely thronged, but in perfect silence the voice of the learned Counsel sounded through the strained hush, and every syllable he uttered was eagerly listened to. At first he spoke very rapidly, as if there were a chance of finishing the trial that night.

He began in measured terms a careful analysis of the case for the prosecution. He appealed to the jury to set aside prejudice, and to regard only the evidence which had been laid before them, and he asked if they could possibly find Mr. Wilde guilty of the terrible offences with which he was charged. It was a serious and grave question which they had to decide. Let them remember that the question as to Wilde was in a great measure distinct from the question of Taylor.

Then he turned upon the Counsel for the Crown for having introduced the conspiracy charges and then withdrawn them. He emphasised the great difficulty in which that course had placed him, illustrating it by showing that, as there was now no longer any joint charge, what was evidence against Taylor was not evidence against Wilde. Had the

prosecution evidence, he asked, which made them put that count of conspiracy upon the indictment? If they had not, why was the count of conspiracy put upon the record, and why were the Counsel for the defence placed for three days under the embarrassment of meeting an indictment, with regard to part of which they could call evidence and with regard to another part of which they could not? He contended that Counsel for the Crown ought to have made up their minds on that point at the outset, and that a cruel hardship had been inflicted on Mr. Wilde. With whatever anxiety the jury might seek to separate in their minds the evidence, they would hardly be able to do so. The evidence of literature which was called against Wilde was not evidence against Taylor; nor was the case of Shelley. At the same time, the character of the young men who frequented Taylor's rooms was no evidence against Wilde. In disentangling the evidence, the jury would be in a terrible position of responsibility.

Passing to the literature, Sir Edward dealt with it as to its use in the cross-examination as to credit. He could not help expressing astonishment that, after he had protested as he did in his former speech against the way in which public feeling had been excited and fanned against Mr. Wilde by the quotation of passages of literature for which Wilde was not responsible, his (Counsel's) learned friend should have devoted the whole of that part of his cross-examination which dealt with the literary questions, to interrogating the witness regarding two poems of which the accused man was not the author. The two poems

were the work of some one else. The questions Mr. Gill asked were not as to anything Mr. Wilde had himself written. The two poems were written by Lord Alfred Douglas, and with them Mr. Wilde had no more to do than he (Sir Edward Clarke) himself or the jury. What could be said about the morality of any of our poets if we were to measure it by the writings, not of themselves, but of others? A poet was no more responsible for what others said than an artist was guilty of murder when he painted a picture depicting the murder of Rizzio at the feet of Mary Queen of Scots.

As to the affection which Mr. Oscar Wilde had expressed in the letters which had been put in, he had himself described it as a pure and true affection, absolutely unconnected with, alien to, irreconcilable with, the filthy practices which "this band of blackmailers" had been narrating. Again, if Mr. Wilde had been guilty, if he had not been innocent in this matter, how would he not have recoiled from being put in the witness-box? Yet he had gone into the witness-box fearless as to what might be produced against him. And Mr. Wilde himself produced in court the first of the two letters which had been used against him. "Mr. Wilde is not an ordinary man," continued Counsel. "He is a man who has written poetry and prose, brilliant dramas, charming essays; a man who from his youth has been trained in the study of the literature of the world, not of this England of ours alone, but of those empires whose glories are to us only a name. He writes letters in a tone which to others may seem high-flown,

inflated, exaggerated, absurd. But he is not ashamed or afraid to produce those letters. He goes into the box and says that they speak of pure love, and when he says so, is he not to be believed? I spoke to you before of the cowardice of guilt. I reminded you that these men—the Woods, the Parkers, the Atkins's, the whole tribe of them—flourish in so frightful a trade, because a man who has been tempted into any sort of guilt would rather give his whole fortune, rather exile himself from his country, than allow the thing to be suggested against him. When you are judging the evidence, contrast this instinctive shrinking of the guilty, upon which these bands of blackmailers live, with the openness with which Mr. Wilde himself sought to have the charges investigated, the courage that brought him into the witness-box in this court to face, once and for all, and, as he hopes and I hope, to dispose of the accusations which were being made against him."

Continuing, Sir Edward said that when a man came forward with those letters and said, "I do not shrink from the judgment of the world upon these productions," they could not say that such a man was not to be believed. Had the defendant in this case not given the best proof of his innocence? Innocence, Counsel declared, had courage and faith in the ultimate judgment of mankind.

Sir Edward then proceeded to deal with the evidence in the case of Shelley, which was, he said, entirely different from the others. In it the jury would have to judge between Mr. Wilde and the young man. In cross-examining Mr. Wilde, con-

tinued Sir Edward, the Counsel for the Crown had persisted in using the term "office boy," perhaps for the purpose of annoying Mr. Wilde, as it did, certainly for showing that such was the difference in the position of the two men, there could be no reasonable explanation of their going about together. The real position was that Mr. Shelley was a young man who was making deep studies in literature, and who expressed his deep admiration for Mr. Wilde's own works. No man was insensible to the frank and honest admiration of a young man for any work of his, were it poem or speech. Mr. Wilde wished to return the kindness, and he gave Shelley a ticket for his play, and so on. Was there any one instance in which there had been the slightest attempt at secrecy?

Shelley said that Mr. Wilde took him into the bedroom, kissed him, and insulted him. But notice, as no doubt the jury had done, the conduct of that young man when he went into the witness-box. He could scarcely be held. He "had been insulted, degraded," he shouted; he did not know the character of the man, he said; and made out that whilst under the influence of drink Mr. Wilde had offered him an insufferable insult. Yet, though he showed what he thought of what he says occurred, he admitted that he went the next night with Mr. Wilde to the theatre. Mr. Wilde denied the story emphatically. Would the jury, even were there nothing to support that denial, commit a man to the suffering and degradation which their verdict might mean in this case? But there was much to support the denial. Fortunately,

Mr. Wilde had kept letters Shelley wrote to him; and those letters not only made it seem impossible that the incident ever took place, but, with the admissions of the young man himself, showed that there were times when Shelley's intellect was affected.

Sir Edward next dealt with the Savoy Hotel evidence, the next in importance against Wilde. He pointed out what remarkable evidence it was. The chambermaid, though a woman whom Mr. Wilde did not know at all, would have one believe that Mr. Wilde rang for her and allowed her to go into his room to light the fire, whilst there was lying in bed a boy with whom he had had improper relations. Then as to the linen. How was it that not one scrap of similar evidence could be obtained from any of the other hotels at which Mr. Wilde had stayed? Why was it that none of the detectives for the prosecution could find any such evidence even as to the rooms Taylor occupied, where in the course of twelve months there must have been some linen sent to the laundry? Migge's story was of the most amazing character. He even admitted that Mr. Wilde was expecting him. Yet he says that he opened the door of the room, saw Mr. Wilde dressing on one side of the chamber and a boy in the bed on the other side of the room. How was it that no one could be found who ever saw those boys either go into or come out from the hotel?

As to Parker, Wood, and Atkins, it did not need, said Sir Edward, the experience those three young men had had in blackmailing to teach them that they must make use of circumstances which actually

occurred in order to suggest others. And having dealt with what they had suggested, the eloquent advocate, with thrilling accents, revived the scene of the previous Saturday, when Atkins made his notorious denials and his even more notorious retractions of those denials.

“ Those three witnesses,” continued Sir Edward, “ Charles Parker, Wood, and Atkins, witnesses for the Crown, have admitted their participation in such practices as ought to disentitle their evidence to the slightest credence. You will never forget, for few juries have ever seen such, the scene that happened in the witness-box on Saturday. You noticed how Atkins met those questions of mine with steady and stolid denial.’’ Did the police know who Atkins was, and his shameful history? Was it the Public Prosecutor alone who was ignorant of Atkins’s character? And if he were not, if he knew of these incidents in that shameful record of Burton and Atkins, what was the meaning of the Crown calling Atkins into the witness-box for his evidence to be accepted as if it were untainted? Those who conduct criminal prosecutions have a duty towards the defendant as well as to the Crown and the public. It deepened one’s horror that Mr. Wilde was at the peril of these persons, to think that had the trial been finishing that day the denials made by Atkins might have had their effect upon the jury.

It was through detailed information, which he had received in anonymous letters, Counsel went on, that he was enabled to convict the witness Atkins on Saturday of the attempted extortion which he so

persistently denied until confronted with the police officers who had taken him into custody. It was strange, thought Counsel, that the Public Prosecutor, if he knew of this witness's real character, should have permitted Mr. Gill to tender his evidence against the accused. Wood, Parker, and Atkins, too, had shared the profits of blackmailing, and Counsel protested that it should not be accepted, on the uncorroborated evidence of men like them, that before 1892 they were uncorrupted. Sir Edward laid stress also on the fact that all Mr. Wilde's movements had been open. He submitted that the evidence called for the prosecution was not reliable testimony, that the principal witnesses for the prosecution—whose evidence was wholly uncorroborated—belonged to a wretched gang of blackmailers, and that Shelley had admitted that his mind was disordered at the time he wrote the letters that had been produced.

Sir Edward Clarke concluded his speech with the following peroration:—

“ I know with what extreme difficulty it is that juries are able to efface from their recollection things which bias their judgment, and to address themselves only to that evidence which is sound and true. Before you deal with this case, therefore, I implore you to make the effort; and let your judgment be affected only by those witnesses with regard to whom you can say with a clear conscience that you, as honourable men, are entitled to be guided by true and honest and honourable testimony. Fix your minds firmly on the tests that ought to be applied to evidence, before you can condemn a fellow man on a charge

like this. If you guard yourselves from these prejudices which have floated about—they have been dissipated to some extent by the incidents of the last few days, but from them all it is impossible that the atmosphere should be absolutely clear—then I trust that the result of your deliberations will be to gratify those thousands of hopes which are hanging upon your decision, and will clear from this fearful imputation one of our most renowned and accomplished men of letters of to-day, and, in clearing him, will clear Society from a stain.”

An outburst of applause followed the conclusion of Sir Edward Clarke’s speech, which had occupied nearly two hours in the delivery. The expressions of sympathy were at once silenced. Mr. Wilde seemed to be visibly affected, and wrote a short note, which was handed down to his learned Counsel.

MR. GRAIN’S SPEECH FOR ALFRED TAYLOR

Mr. Grain then rose to address the jury on behalf of his client, Alfred Taylor. In regard to the charge of procuring, Mr. Grain showed that the two lads named Parker were the only witnesses who claimed to have been introduced by Taylor to Wilde, and all the resources of the Crown, and of the eminent solicitors employed by Lord Queensberry, had been unable to produce any corroboration of their story of misconduct. Mr. Grain explained that Taylor, having run through his own large fortune, was living at Little College Street on an allowance from his

father's firm. If Taylor had been employed by Mr. Wilde, where was the proof of any kind of payment? Not a farthing piece, in money or in value, had been shown to have passed between the two. Against Taylor the evidence adduced was tainted from beginning to end, and Counsel claimed for his client the benefit of the doubt.

MR. GILL'S SPEECH FOR THE PROSECUTION

It was nearly five o'clock when Mr. Gill rose to address the jury on behalf of the prosecution. He spoke for nearly two hours, and summed up all the evidence which had been brought forward.

It had been argued, he said, that no man conscious of guilt would have dared to set the criminal law in motion against Lord Queensberry. As to that, they could not tell what was upon the prisoner Wilde's mind, or how far he was misled by the expectation that the case would take an entirely different course. The fact remained that, from the first, Lord Queensberry undertook to justify his libel. The charges now made against the defendants formed only a part of the allegations contained in the plea of justification, the reason being that some of the charges alleged were out of the jurisdiction of Bow Street Police Court. Sir Edward Clarke had made a courageous and brilliant defence, and incidentally had made an admission, of which he (Mr. Gill) now took full advantage, that he was in part, at least responsible for the course taken on Mr. Wilde's behalf at the previous trial, and that in part, at least, it was due to

that circumstance that he (Sir Edward Clarke) was now again appearing on behalf of the accused. So far as the conditional charge originally made by Lord Queensberry went, Counsel had not found it necessary to cross-examine the defendant Wilde, for Mr. Wilde's own Counsel had admitted that the justification was proved and that it was for the public benefit that the libel was published.

As to the letters to Lord Alfred Douglas, it seemed to Mr. Gill that they breathed an unholy passion. Why, Counsel asked, should any of the witnesses have sought to give false evidence? What end were they to serve? What good were they to get by it?

Against the respectability and credibility of the lad Shelley nothing could possibly be said. He stood entirely apart from the others. Was it suggested that out of horrible wickedness, or in some sort of dream, he had come to that court to perjure himself against Mr. Oscar Wilde, who, apart from those charges, had done him nothing but kindness?

Mr. Gill began commenting on the evidence of Sidney Mavor, when the Judge interposed and said that, although this witness's evidence was important, yet he had denied that he had been guilty of impropriety, and he (the learned Judge) did not think that the counts in reference to Mavor could stand. After some further discussion these counts were struck out of the indictment.

Before concluding, Mr. Gill went on to deal in detail with the statements made by the witnesses on behalf of the prosecution. Counsel remarked that there was nothing to support the suggestion of Sir

Edward Clarke that Shelley, who had shown himself to be an absolutely respectable and trustworthy witness, was in a disordered state of mind; while as to those witnesses who had been described as blackmailers, they could have no conceivable object in bringing the accusations against the accused unless the charges they made were true in substance and in fact.

At the close of the case for the prosecution, Mr. Gill stated that he should not ask for a verdict on the counts for conspiracy.

Counsel did not conclude his address till seven o'clock, at which hour the court adjourned.

Mr. Justice Charles announced that he would begin his summing up on the following morning.

xiv.—CONCLUSION OF THE TRIAL

Wednesday, May 1st, was the fifth and last day of the trial. It had been a long time since any trial at the Old Bailey had lasted so many days, and still longer since there had been so much uncertainty as to the ultimate result in a trial of such importance. Counsel engaged in the case were early in attendance. On the defendants being brought into the dock, it was noticed that Wilde looked haggard and unwell. He, however, bore himself with his customary becoming demeanour under the heavy strain. In anticipation of the verdict being arrived at, the court was densely crowded.

THE JUDGE'S SUMMING UP

On taking his seat on the bench, the Judge, Mr. Justice Charles, at once began his summing up.

He described the charges against the prisoners of committing acts of indecency; there being against Taylor a further charge of procuring the commission of such acts. His lordship expressed satisfaction that the counts charging the accused with conspiracy had been withdrawn. He was sure he did not know why those counts had ever been inserted at all. It was a highly inconvenient course to join counts with regard to one of which the prisoners could give evidence,

while with regard to the other they could not. He should therefore direct an acquittal upon the charges of conspiracy against both the prisoners, as well as upon one count of the indictment to which he need not further allude, but as to it there was no evidence proper for the jury's consideration.

He begged the jury to free themselves from prejudice and to apply their minds to the evidence and to the evidence only. For weeks it had been impossible to open a newspaper without reading some reference to the case, and especially to the prisoner Wilde, but his lordship hoped that the jury would not allow any preconceived opinions to weigh with them in trying two persons, both of good education, one of them being a man of high intellectual gifts.

As to the evidence, where acts of indecency were alleged to have been committed with the consent of the witnesses, those persons were accomplices in the wicked act; and by a wholesome practice of the English courts, for certainly two hundred years, no person could be convicted on the uncorroborated evidence and testimony of an accomplice in his crime. Otherwise, innocent people might be exposed to terrible dangers by designing or spiteful persons. In this case, therefore, had there been no corroboration of the evidence of the young men to whom the jury had listened, it would have been his lordship's duty at once to direct an acquittal. But he was clearly of opinion that there was corroboration, in the sense that the law required, in all the cases—not corroboration by eye-witnesses of the acts, for that could not be expected,

but corroboration as to acquaintanceship and to many of the incidents arising out of it.

The witnesses, continued his lordship, were not only accomplices, but in the case of Parker, Wood, and Atkins, they had been properly described by Sir Edward Clarke as blackmailers, and the jury should remember what they had admitted themselves. With regard to Atkins, that witness was out of his own mouth convicted of having told the grossest and most deliberate falsehoods. Those witnesses required, therefore, not only corroboration, but the jury had to remember their characters.

The Judge said he did not propose to deal at any length with the incidents of the Queensberry trial; but it must be remembered that the evidence which Wilde gave at that trial was given upon oath, and it must not be lost sight of in considering that which he had given in that court on the previous day. Further, it was necessary to remember that the verdict in the Queensberry trial was in no way binding on the jury to whom his lordship was addressing himself. They all knew how the case arose. Lord Queensberry published a card which undoubtedly libelled Wilde, and the latter at once initiated proceedings for criminal libel, which proceedings led to the trial on which they were at that moment embarked. It was a point in Wilde's favour that he had himself challenged inquiry into the accusations made against him. The libel referred to occurrences in 1892, but was not published until 1895. After Wilde had been examined and cross-examined, but before any evidence had been called for the plea of justification, Wilde by his

Counsel agreed to a verdict that Lord Queensberry was not guilty of criminal libel, and that the publication of the card was for the public benefit.

His lordship referred to the plea of justification and to the reason why such offences as it alleged in connection with the lads Conway and Grainger were not included in the present indictment, those offences having occurred, if at all, outside the jurisdiction of that court. On the conclusion of the Queensberry trial, Wilde and Taylor were arrested to answer the charges on which they now awaited the jury's verdict.

THE LITERARY PART OF THE CASE

A very large portion of the evidence of Wilde at the Queensberry trial was devoted to what Sir Edward Clarke had called "the literary part of the case," said the Judge. It was attempted to show by cross-examination of Wilde, as to works he had published—especially in regard to the book called "Dorian Gray"—that Wilde was a man of most unprincipled character in regard to the relations of men to boys. Secondly, in regard to a magazine called "The Chameleon," published in the autumn of 1894, it was alleged that Wilde had given the sanction of his name to the most abominable doctrines. His lordship had not read "Dorian Gray," and he supposed that the jury had not, but they had been told that it was the story of a youth of vicious character whose face did not reveal the abysses of wickedness into which he had fallen, but a picture painted by an

artist friend revealed all the consequences of the young man's passion.

His lordship did not think that in a criminal case the jury should place any unfavourable inference upon the fact that Wilde was the author of "Dorian Gray." It was, the learned Judge added, unfortunately true that while some of their most distinguished and noble-minded writers had spent their lives in producing wholesome literature, there were others who had given to the world books which it was painful for persons of ordinary modesty and decency to read. Sir Edward Clarke had quoted from Coleridge: "Judge no man by his books." But his lordship would prefer to say: "Confound no man with the characters of the persons he creates." Because a novelist put into the mouth of his villain the most abominable sentiments it must not be supposed that he shared them. You may criticise, if you please, the work; but it would never do, if the author of the work was charged with crime, to say, "Oh, you created that monster in your last novel, and you put into his mouth sentiments abhorrent to humanity." That would not be fair. While such great writers as Scott and Dickens had never written, so far as he knew, a single unwholesome line, yet there were other very great writers, especially in the eighteenth century, of whom the same could not be said.

In dealing with the association which it was attempted to prove of Wilde with the magazine called "The Chameleon," the Judge said that the only connection proved between that magazine and Wilde was that it was prefaced by two or three pages of "Phrases

and Philosophies for the Use of the Young" by the accused, of which it was sufficient to say that some were amusing, some cynical, some—if his lordship might be allowed to criticise—silly, but wicked, no, not wicked in the sense of the wickedness it was now sought to bring home to Wilde. Then, too, it must be remembered that "The Chameleon" was published only last autumn, long after the date of the offences alleged against Wilde.

The learned Counsel who represented Lord Queensberry, the Judge continued, had called attention to a story, a filthy narrative of a most disgusting character, called "The Priest and the Acolyte," of which the author, who signed himself "X," should be thoroughly ashamed. With that story Wilde had nothing whatever to do, and to impute to him anything in it was quite absurd. To judge him by another man's works which he had never seen would be not only highly unjust but utterly absurd.

His lordship then said that he would pass to another phase of the literary part of the case which had more relevancy to the issue which the jury were trying. In the same "Chameleon" were two poems by Lord Alfred Douglas—one called "In Praise of Shame" and the other called "Two Loves." It was alleged that these poems had an immoral and unnatural tendency, and that Wilde had approved of them. What was it Wilde had said in reference to them?

His lordship then read the sonnet "In Praise of Shame," and quoted a few lines from the poem called "Two Loves." He then proceeded to read Wilde's

letter to Lord Alfred Douglas beginning: "Your sonnet is quite lovely, and it is a marvel that those red rose-leaf lips of yours should be made no less for music of song than for madness of kisses." His lordship evidently was under the impression that this letter referred to the sonnet in "The Chameleon" which he had just read; but Sir Edward Clarke rose at once to point out that the letter bore a date long antecedent to the publication of "The Chameleon," and clearly referred to some other sonnet.

His lordship admitted that he was mistaken, but went on to read the letter, and also the letter written from the Savoy Hotel in 1893, in which Wilde addressed Lord Alfred Douglas as "Dearest of all Boys," and wrote: "Your letter was delightful, red and yellow wine to me," and concluded: "I fear I must leave," having "no money, no credit, and a heart of lead."

Turning from the poems to these letters, his lordship questioned if Mr. Carson was right in regarding them as of a horrible and indecent character. Mr. Wilde himself had said that he was not in any sense ashamed of either of those two letters, and that although they breathed the language of affection and passion, it was not unnatural passion. He had described the first as "a kind of prose poem," and had said that to his mind there was nothing unnatural or impure in the passionate affection of a man for a youth; and that the love mentioned in the poem, "Two Loves," was like the love of David and Jonathan, or that which Plato called the beginning of wisdom. This was, however, a part of the case on

which the jury must exercise their own judgment.

Wilde had said that the word "shame" in the sonnet meant modesty, shame in the sense that was felt by our first parents in the Garden of Eden. The jury must weigh this. Further, there was this to be said about that first letter of sufficient importance, undoubtedly, to be well worthy of their attention—it was produced by Wilde himself in his examination in chief at the trial which took place last sessions; and so it was said on his behalf by his counsel, "Give him credit for not being ashamed of it." He (the learned Judge) understood that the other letter, the one written from the Savoy Hotel, was produced during the defendant's cross-examination.

Mr. Gill :—That is so, my lord.

THE CASE OF SHELLEY

Leaving that part of the case behind, his lordship said he would deal in order of date with the charges contained in the indictment.

Taking the case of Shelley first, the Judge said that the offence was alleged to have been committed at the beginning of 1892, and it was a most anxious task for the jury to make up their minds as to whether the charge was made out or not. Shelley was, undoubtedly, notwithstanding what he might say as to his having been in a semi-state of intoxication, in the position of an accomplice; and if Shelley's evidence had not been corroborated, his lordship would have had to withdraw that charge from the jury. On the other hand, Shelley was not tainted with the sort of

offences with which Wood, Atkins, and Parker were charged, and in that sense he was an untainted witness. Shelley was employed in the publishing office of Messrs. Mathews and Lane, at a salary of 15s. to 18s. a week. He had been described as an office boy, but it was clear from his letters that he was a person of some education, with literary tastes and a consuming admiration for the works of the defendant Wilde. Mathews and Lane being Wilde's publishers, Wilde, made the acquaintance of this lad and took him to dine at the Albemarle Hotel, where, Shelley declares, indecencies took place between them. The jury were the best judges of the demeanour of the witness, who certainly appeared in the witness-box in a very excited state. His testimony rather indicated that the acts which he alleged against Wilde were committed against his will; but that could hardly be, having regard to what followed, for within the same week he went a second time to the Albemarle, besides going to more than one theatre with Wilde. The prisoner Wilde positively denied the story of the indecencies, while he said it was true that he was interested in the lad and went about with him to some extent. Shelley had sworn that he wrote a letter to the accused saying he would have no more to do with a man of Wilde's morality, and the witness had been allowed to give to the best of his recollection the contents of that letter. That letter Wilde denied ever having received. Other letters, however, were forthcoming in which Shelley addressed Wilde in familiar terms, such as "My dear Oscar." In some of them even he begged for material assistance. How did that fit in with Shelley's state-

ment that before this time Wilde had taken unwelcome liberties with him? Could the jury reconcile it, too, with the positive denials of Wilde at such a suggestion?

His lordship then read several letters from Shelley to Wilde, many of which were of a morbid and hysterical character.

His lordship continued that Shelley had accounted for the tone of his letters by adopting the suggestion that his mind had become disordered. Would that suggestion account for his making such nauseous admissions as his charge against Wilde involved? Shelley's correspondence showed excitability, but to suggest that it showed the witness did not know what he was saying was to exaggerate. The serious responsibility of accepting or rejecting Shelley's evidence must rest with the jury. Why should he tell his shameful story at all unless it were true?

THE CASE OF ATKINS

His lordship passed next to the case of Atkins. Atkins was, his lordship said, now twenty years of age, and had been introduced to Taylor by a young man named Schwabe in 1892. Atkins met Wilde and Lord Alfred Douglas at dinner in a private room at the Café Florence, and he alleges that at that dinner Wilde asked him to go to Paris with him as his private secretary. Atkins agreed, and they went two days later, occupying rooms in the Boulevard des Capucines. Atkins spent the evening at the Moulin Rouge, which, his lordship gathered from the

evidence, was a place where immoral women congregate. Atkins alleges that on returning in the early hours of the morning, he found Wilde and Schwabe occupying the same bed, and that the next morning—or rather, later that same morning—Wilde made improper overtures to him, which he rejected. On their return to London Atkins says that he saw Wilde at Tite Street, and was asked to say nothing about the visit to Paris. In December, 1893, when he was sickening for small-pox, he was visited by Wilde at a room in Osnaburgh Street, which Atkins shared with a man named Burton. The charge in reference to Atkins was not in reference to what was alleged to have occurred in Paris. That was beyond the jurisdiction of the court. The charges referred to the alleged agreement of Taylor and Wilde at the Florence Hotel to get hold of the lad for immoral purposes. Wilde's account of the matter was that he did meet the youth at dinner, and that he took him to Paris with him at the request of Schwabe, who had promised to take him over. Wilde was himself going to Paris on literary business, but has denied that Atkins went in any way as his secretary. Atkins was a most reckless, unreliable, unscrupulous, and untruthful witness. He had the impudence to deny in cross-examination that he and the man named Burton were ever taken to Rochester Row police station for a gross case of blackmailing. But it turned out that the witness had told the grossest of falsehoods—a falsehood so gross that the jury would be justified, if they thought fit, in declining to act on any of his evidence. Atkins admitted that on

June 10th, 1891, he and Burton were taken to the police station, where the gentleman who gave them into custody refused to charge them. Many other suggestions were made against Atkins. Mr. Gill had said that Atkins might be a blackmailer, but that there was no suggestion that he had ever tried to blackmail the prisoners, and his lordship therefore invited the jury to accept, in spite of Atkins's admissions, the story of the dinner at the Florence and the trip to Paris.

THE CASE OF THE SAVOY HOTEL

His lordship then passed on to the charges alleged against Wilde with two unknown boys at the Savoy Hotel in the month of March, 1893, when Lord Alfred Douglas was also staying in the hotel for a week. Repulsive as were the details of the evidence given by the hotel servants as to what they alleged had taken place more than two years previously, his lordship felt bound to go into them with as much minute detail as he had in the other parts of the evidence, but to his mind it seemed strange that, if what the servants alleged was true, there had been so little attempt at concealment. Wilde ringing up the chambermaid to light the fire, and leaving the door open to the hotel masseur, who seemed to have entered without objection, did not appear very much as if improper practices had been going on in Mr. Wilde's room. However, if the hotel servants told the truth, then Wilde's denial that boys had ever been in his bed at the Savoy must be untrue, and it was for

the jury to say on which side the balance of credibility inclined.

THE CASE OF ALFRED WOOD

In dealing with the evidence given by the witness Alfred Wood, his lordship said that Wood made the acquaintance of Taylor in the early part of 1893. He spent three weeks with Taylor in his rooms at Little College Street, and at the end of a month made Wilde's acquaintance. How? Not through an introduction by Taylor, but through Lord Alfred Douglas, who sent him to meet Wilde at the Café Royal. They went together to the Café Florence, dined together, and then drove to Wilde's house at Tite Street, where, Wood alleged, misconduct occurred. There were other meetings, and Wilde bought him a silver watch and chain, and at various times gave him money. Wilde's account of all this was very different. Wilde said that Wood had applied to Lord Alfred Douglas for assistance in getting him employment as a clerk. Lord Alfred, who was at Salisbury, wrote to Wilde, asking him to do what he could for the lad, and at the same time telegraphed to Wood to introduce himself to Wilde at the Café Royal, which Wilde said Wood did. The jury must judge for themselves for what purpose the introduction was effected. Sir Edward Clarke had described Wood as a member of the regular society of blackmailers. It was certain that after a visit to America Wood was concerned with Allen and Parker in sharing £300, which was extorted from a gentleman who had been caught with

Parker. The manner of Wood's going to America was important. Wood's own story was that he wanted to get away from the evil company into which he had fallen, and that Wilde gave him £30 to take him to America. But there was the extraordinary circumstance that at the same interview some letters of Wilde's, which had fallen into the hands of Wood, and which Wilde was very anxious to get back, were restored to Wilde. One letter, however, was in the possession of Allen, who had taken it from Wood's pocket, and subsequently Allen endeavoured to extort money from Wilde for its surrender. After he was in America Wood wrote to Taylor: "Tell Oscar he can send me a draft for an Easter egg if he likes." Mr. Gill had said of Wood, as of Atkins, that Wood did not seem to have endeavoured to blackmail Wilde. Wood had given a pretty complete history of himself, and of his veracity the jury must judge, and it was for them to consider what could have been the inner meaning of the transactions between the two.

THE CHARGES AGAINST ALFRED TAYLOR

His lordship then turned to the charges made directly against Alfred Taylor, the other defendant. He said that Taylor seemed to be a man of good family and education who had run through a large fortune of £45,000. Taylor was charged with acts of indecency with both Charles and William Parker. According to Taylor's own account he was introduced to the Parkers by a friend outside the St. James's Restaurant, and learned that they were valet and

groom respectively, and both out of a place. Parker, on the other hand, declares that he and his brother were in the bar of the St. James's Restaurant when Taylor spoke to them, talked of the money to be made in a certain way, and offered to introduce them to Wilde. They were first taken to Taylor's rooms at Little College Street.

His lordship then repeated in detail the description given by various witnesses of the way in which Taylor's rooms were decorated and furnished, of the burning of incense or perfumes, and of the presence of feminine garments and gold brooches in the rooms. There were frequent tea parties there, continued his lordship, at which Wilde—who said that the rooms struck him as being Bohemian but not strange—was often present. The attention of the police seemed to have been attracted to the place, and, for a time, they kept it under observation. Taylor had denied that he invited "Piccadilly young men" to his rooms, or that he himself had accosted men at the Alhambra or the Empire. March 8th was Taylor's birthday, and, according to his own statement, he was invited by Wilde to dine with him at a restaurant, Kettners or the Solferino, and to bring with him any friends he liked. The dinner did not take place, however, till March 10th, when Taylor took the two Parkers with him and introduced them to Wilde. Now, the evidence of Charles Parker was tainted, but it was confirmed by the evidence of William Parker, his brother, against whom no charges of blackmailing had been made. Both the Parkers described in detail and with circumstance, a luxurious meal, and declared that

Wilde, after paying for the dinner, said of Charles Parker, "This is the boy for me." William Parker saw no more of Wilde, but accuses Taylor of indecent acts at Little College Street and at Chapel Street. That charge was, however, not made when he first gave evidence against the accused, but only when he was recalled for the purpose at a subsequent hearing at the police court.

There was, continued his lordship, to connect Wilde and Taylor further with Charles Parker, the evidence of Mrs. Margery Bancroft that she had seen both prisoners at Parker's lodgings in Park Walk, Chelsea. Wilde had denied on oath that he ever was at Park Walk in his life. He admitted that Parker had been to his rooms at St. James's Place, but he denied the utterly indescribable, filthy action which Parker had said took place there, just as he denied that he ever took Parker to the Savoy Hotel, or that he was guilty of misconduct there. Charles Parker also alleged acts of indecency against the prisoner Taylor, in whose company he was arrested on the occasion of a raid on a house in Fitzroy Street. After that incident Parker had enlisted and went away from London. It was manifest that he was of a low class of morality.

CONCLUSION OF THE SUMMING UP.

That, said his lordship, concluded the various charges made in the case, and he had very little more to say. It was important to remember, however, that other witnesses had been called by the prosecution.

who had not charged either prisoner with misconduct. Sidney Mavor, who had stayed with Taylor and had met Wilde and Lord Alfred Douglas at dinner, and had stayed all night at the Albemarle Hotel, had entirely denied that any misconduct had ever taken place, so that his evidence was rather in favour of Wilde than against him.

His lordship stated that he had summed up with great minuteness because the case was one of great importance to the public at large. At the same time it was important that innocent men should not be convicted. Wilde was a man of high intellectual gifts, whom they would have supposed incapable of such practices. Taylor, too, was a man who had been well brought up. At the same time, the jury were bound to consider the evidence, and, if they deemed it conclusive, they must say that the prisoners were, or that either prisoner was, guilty. They were required to say whether Wilde committed the acts of indecency charged; whether Taylor procured the commission of those acts; and, thirdly, whether Taylor committed acts of indecency with the lads named Parker.

At the conclusion of Mr. Justice Charles's summing up, which had occupied three hours,

The Foreman of the Jury, addressing his lordship, asked:—May we retire, my lord?

The Judge:—Certainly, gentlemen.

QUESTIONS FOR THE JURY TO DECIDE

The Judge left the following questions to the jury:—

(1) Do you think that Wilde committed indecent acts with Edward Shelley and Alfred Wood and with a person or persons unknown at the Savoy Hotel or with Charles Parker?

(2) Did Taylor procure or attempt to procure the commission of these acts or of any of them?

(3) Did Wilde and Taylor, or either of them attempt to get Atkins to commit indecencies?

(4) Did Taylor commit indecent acts with Charles Parker or with William Parker?

The jury retired at twenty-five minutes to two, and the accused were at once removed from the dock. The Judge remained on the bench for some time, as if he did not expect the jury to be very long in coming to a decision. At three o'clock a communication was brought from the jury and conveyed by the Clerk of Arraigns to his lordship. It afterwards transpired that this was a request that some lunch might be sent to the jury. As the time went on the possibility of the jury failing to come to any definite decision was foreseen, and it was nearly a quarter-past five when the jury returned into court.

The clerk of the court, addressing the warders, then said, "Bring the prisoners up," and Oscar Wilde and Alfred Taylor accordingly reappeared in the dock where they stood, the first-named betraying no sign either of hope or anxiety, and the other accused smiling complacently.

His lordship then said: Gentlemen of the Jury, I

have received a communication from you to the effect that with the exception of the minor question which I put to you in regard to Atkins you are unable to arrive at an agreement.

The Foreman of the Jury:—That is so, my lord. We cannot agree upon three of the questions you submitted to us.

The Judge:—Is there any prospect that if you retired to your room—you have not been inconvenienced, you know, because I ordered what you asked—and continued your deliberations a little longer you would be able to come to an agreement at least on some of the questions?

The Foreman:—I put that also to my fellow-jurymen. We have considered the question for three hours, and the only result we have come to is that we cannot agree.

The Judge:—You are not agreed, I find, as regards any of the other questions which I left you. Is there anything which you desire to ask me with reference to the case which you think would assist you in further deliberating upon your verdict?

The Foreman:—It would be useless, my lord. We cannot agree on any of the sub-divisions of questions (1) and (4).

The Judge:—I am very unwilling to do anything at any time which should look like compelling a jury to deliver a verdict. You have been very long in deliberation over this matter, and no doubt you have done your very best to arrive at agreement on the questions. On the other hand, the inconveniences of another trial are very great, and if you thought there

was any prospect of agreement, after deliberating further, I would ask you to do so.

The Foreman :—My lord, I fear there is no chance of agreement.

The Judge :—That being so, I do not feel justified in detaining you any longer.

VERDICT OF "NOT GUILTY" GIVEN ON CERTAIN COUNTS

Sir Edward Clarke then applied that a verdict of "Not guilty" should be entered upon the counts of the indictment upon which no evidence had been given.

The Judge :—I thought I had already taken the necessary steps for that to be done, Sir Edward Clarke, when I informed the jury in the course of this morning that I should direct an acquittal upon the counts on which no evidence had been offered. Those are the counts of conspiracy and those which charged Taylor with certain acts.

Mr. Gill resisted the application on the grounds that the opinion of the jury had not been asked on those counts. If the jury were discharged, he would ask his lordship to discharge them without a verdict of any kind in the matter.

Sir Edward Clarke :—That cannot be done, my lord. I am entitled to a verdict upon the counts on which no evidence has been given before the jury. I need hardly point out to your lordship that on the ground of convenience as well as of right that verdict ought to be entered.

Mr. Gill :—Sir Edward is not quite right in saying that no evidence was given on those counts.

The Judge :—I have already directed the jury to return a verdict of acquittal on the charges of conspiracy and also on four counts relating to Mavor and Wood. It seems to me that the defendants are entitled to have such a verdict put upon the record. Unfortunately the really material matters that have occupied the court for so many days are the matters on which the jury have failed to agree.

Sir Edward Clarke :—I wish to have that entered. We are entitled to it.

Mr. Gill :—I think there is a misapprehension as to the course taken with regard to those conspiracy counts. It was not that evidence was not offered upon them. Evidence was given which would have had a bearing on those counts in the course of the case, and, of course, they had a direct bearing with respect to the other charges. All that I said was that I did not desire a verdict on those counts.

The Judge :—I am quite aware of the way you have put it, Mr. Gill. You said at the close of the prosecution that you elected to ask the jury to answer questions to the other counts, but that election having been made at the time when the defendants were given in charge of the jury, it seems to me that it entitles him to have a verdict of "Not guilty" upon the record. I do not think it is a matter of substantial importance, but subject to what was said to me as to the criminal practice, it seems to me that that is the right course to take; and I should say the same with regard to the counts on which Taylor is charged,

to which I have alluded—counts 16 and 20. I must further direct that the same course be taken with regard to the tenth and eleventh counts as I have ordered to be taken with regard to the conspiracy counts and the counts as to Mavor and Wood. The jury being of opinion that Wilde and Taylor did not attempt to get Atkins to commit an offence with Wilde, I shall order the same course to be taken with regard to the conspiracy charges and the others upon which there has been no evidence.

Sir Edward Clarke :—It is only a matter of form, but it is not unimportant; and as the whole indictment has been given in charge to the jury, I ask that your lordship will direct the jury to take a verdict of “ Not guilty ” upon the conspiracy counts.

The Judge (addressing the jury) :—You understood me this morning, gentlemen, to direct a verdict upon the counts I explained, and also upon the other counts to which I have just made allusion.

The jury then formally returned a verdict of “ Not Guilty ” on all the counts alleging conspiracy and also on those that alleged misconduct with the witnesses Mavor and Wood.

The taking of the verdict of the jury by the Clerk of Arraigns, in accordance with his lordship’s directions, was as follows :—

The Clerk of Arraigns :—Gentlemen of the Jury, upon the counts of conspiracy you find the prisoners not guilty ?

The Foreman of the Jury :—Not guilty.

To the rest of the indictment you are unable to agree ?—That is so.

The Judge (addressing the jury):—As the matters which have kept the court so long remain undecided you are discharged, gentlemen.

The jury were then discharged.

APPLICATION FOR BAIL

Sir Edward Clarke:—I have now to make an application that Mr. Oscar Wilde be admitted to bail. I should think that after what has taken place the Crown would make no objection.

Mr. Clarke Hall made a similar application on behalf of Alfred Taylor.

Mr. Gill:—With regard to the question of bail, it will depend upon what course your lordship thinks desirable. With regard to the fresh trial, if it is to take place immediately the question of bail would not be important to the defendants; but if it is to go to the next sessions I shall say nothing upon the matter. All the facts of this case are before your lordship, and I will say nothing to influence your lordship's judgment in the matter.

The Judge:—I do not feel that I am able to accede to the application.

Sir Edward Clarke:—I suppose that I may renew the application, on other material, to a judge in chambers?

The Judge:—Yes, I think the application must be renewed in the ordinary way to a judge in chambers.

Sir Edward Clarke:—I do not think that such a trial as this ought to take place immediately. The burden and pressure on those engaged in the case has

been very great. The Treasury, too, I should think, would like to have an opportunity of considering between this and another session the mode in which the case should be presented, if at all.

Mr. Gill :—The case will certainly be tried again; but whether at the next Sessions or not will depend on what is the most convenient course. Probably the most convenient course will be that it should be taken at the next Sessions. That is the usual course.

The Judge :—If that be the usual course, let it be so.

Mr. Gill :—All the witnesses will be bound over and their recognisances enlarged?

The Judge :—Certainly.

The court then adjourned, the defendants having previously been removed in custody.

xv.—OSCAR WILDE RELEASED ON BAIL

On Friday, May 3rd, Mr. Charles Mathews made an application before Mr. Baron Pollock in chambers to allow Mr. Oscar Wilde out on bail till the time of his new trial. Mr. Mathews cited a number of cases which tended to show that in a case of misdemeanour a judge had no discretion in the matter, but was bound under an Act of Charles II. to admit the accused to bail.

For the prosecution Mr. C. F. Gill did not offer any serious objection to the question of bail, but he begged the judge to read carefully through the depositions and to bear in mind the nature of the case.

Mr. Baron Pollock promised to do so and to grant bail. He asked what was the amount of bail which Mr. Mathews was prepared to offer, and Counsel answered that he proposed to offer two sureties in the sum of £1,000 each. Thereupon Mr. Baron Pollock announced that he would give his decision on the following morning after he had had an opportunity of conferring with Mr. Justice Charles who had tried the case.

The affidavit upon which the application was made was sworn by Mr. Humphreys, Mr. Oscar Wilde's solicitor, and was of a formal character only. It set out the facts of the case, the date of the trial which had just taken place, and the result of it, and the pro-

bable date of the next trial. No grounds for granting the application were suggested, as the Judge had no option but to grant bail, the only point on which his lordship was at liberty to exercise his discretion being the amount of bail which he was prepared to accept. Counsel argued.

On the following morning the legal representatives of both sides were present in Mr. Baron Pollock's private room, and his lordship announced that he had decided to fix the amount of bail at £5,000. The prisoner Wilde would have to give his personal security for £2,500 and find two sureties in £1,250 each.

Mr. Charles Mathews, on hearing this, intimated that he should have no difficulty in finding one surety for a very much larger sum.

Mr. Baron Pollock replied that in that case another application had better be made to him on the following Monday morning (May 6th).

Detective-Inspector Brockwell was present in chambers, and Mr. Humphreys, Wilde's solicitor, informed him who the sureties would in all probability be, but it was necessary for formal notice to be given at Bow Street in order that the police might make the usual inquiries.

No further application for bail was made on behalf of Taylor.

On the following Tuesday, May 7th, Mr. Travers Humphreys, Mr. Angus Lewis, of the Treasury, and Detective-Inspector Brockwell, of Scotland Yard, attended at Bow Street police station with reference to the proposed bail of Mr. Oscar Wilde.

The presiding magistrate was Mr. Vaughan, and Mr. Humphreys, addressing his worship, said that Mr. Baron Pollock had fixed the amount of bail at two sureties of £1,250 each, with the defendant himself in the sum of £2,500. Two gentlemen, added Mr. Humphreys, were present and were willing to enter into sureties to produce Mr. Oscar Wilde at the next ensuing Sessions.

Mr. Vaughan :—Who are they?

Mr. Humphreys :—They are the Rev. Stewart Headlam, of 31, Upper Bedford Place, and Lord Douglas of Hawick and Tibbers.

Mr. Vaughan :—Is there any objection on the part of the Treasury?

Mr. Angus Lewis :—No, sir.

Mr. Headlam and Lord Douglas of Hawick then entered into the necessary recognisances, and Mr. Vaughan directed that Mr. Oscar Wilde should be brought from Holloway to Bow Street in order that he might enter into his own recognisances as directed by the judge.

Sergeant White, of Bow Street, at once proceeded in a cab to Holloway and returned with Mr. Wilde. Some further formalities had to be gone through to enable Mr. Wilde legally to enter into his own recognisances for £2,500, but eventually after signing the bail book he was able to leave the court with his sureties. Mr. Wilde then drove to the Midland Hotel at St. Pancras, and after staying a few hours, he left before dinner with Lord Douglas of Hawick. It is said that he was refused admission at more than one hotel that night, and that he eventually sought shelter in his

brother's rooms at Chelsea from a mob of roughs who followed him about. He remained there, or stayed with friends, until he surrendered to his bail for his fresh trial.

Reference has already been made to the attitude of a certain section of the Press in its hostility to Wilde at this time. Perhaps the grossest and most unfair of all the instances was an article which appeared in a morning journal which had been one of the worst offenders in this way. This paper gave what purported to be an analysis of the voting of the jury on the various charges which had to be considered at the trial. Probably the figures were entirely fictitious, but the glaring injustice of publishing them is none the less obvious.

The alleged voting was as follows:—

(1) Did Wilde commit indecent acts—

- (a) with Shelley?—10 *for*, 2 *against*.
- (b) with Wood?—8 *for*, 4 *against*.
- (c) with two persons unknown at the Savoy?—
10 *for*, 2 *against*.
- (d) with Charles Parker?—10 *for*, 2 *against*.

(2) Did Taylor procure, or attempt to procure, the commission of the acts, or any of them?—10 *for*, 2 *against*.

(3) Did Wilde and Taylor, or either of them,

attempt to get Atkins to commit indecency with Wilde.—*Agreed not guilty.*

(4) Did Taylor commit indecent acts (a) with Charles Parker, (b) with William Parker?—2 for, 10 against.

At the time of the publication of this alleged analysis of the voting, Wilde had not been convicted of any offence. He was still waiting to take his trial some days later. One newspaper which, almost alone, refused to condemn Wilde (and even for several weeks after his conviction gravely questioned his guilt and the justice of his sentence), said: “Anything more cruel, heartless, and reckless than the publication of these details we are happy to say is rare in the journalism of to-day.”

The truth, which is sufficiently remarkable, was that out of twenty-five counts in the original indictment two were struck out by the Judge, three were abandoned by the prosecution, on the three counts in reference to Atkins the defendants were found not guilty, and on the rest the jury returned no verdict.

There can be little doubt that if a jury could have been impanelled, the members of which had not read a newspaper report nor heard the evil rumours connected with his name, Wilde would have been acquitted. On the evidence alone it seems almost impossible to believe that he could have been convicted by a jury—purchased evidence of hired blackmailers as most of it was. It is not pleasant to think that any man might be arraigned and convicted of

shameful offences on the testimony of despicable creatures such as those produced by the prosecution in this case.

The Rev. Stewart Headlam was interviewed by a Press representative after the conclusion of the formalities connected with the release of Mr. Oscar Wilde on bail. When asked as to the reasons which induced him to become bail for Wilde, Mr. Headlam replied: "I have undertaken the responsibility on public grounds. I felt that the public mind had been prejudiced before the trial began, and I was anxious to give Mr. Wilde any help I could to enable him to stand his trial in good health and spirits."

After becoming surety for Wilde, Mr. Stewart Headlam was the recipient of a number of letters containing obscene rhymes and vile insinuations. Two or three of his cowardly assailants even resorted to the use of post-cards. In all cases the writers preferred to remain anonymous.

On the other hand, Mr. Headlam was also overwhelmed with communications from friends and others congratulating him upon his bold and generous conduct.

At a meeting of the Fabian Society which he attended a few days later, Mr. Headlam, on entering the hall, received a reception that clearly betokened approval of his action. Mr. Headlam had always been much interested in the question of "Church and Stage," and his action was influenced partly by the attitude adopted towards the author of "Lady Windermere's Fan," "The Importance of Being

Earnest," etc., by the theatrical managers, who, while still performing Wilde's plays, and making large sums of money from them, removed the author's name from their play-bills and programmes. Mr. Headlam is said to have been much impressed also by the manly way in which Wilde had gone through his fiery ordeal.

III.—THE THIRD TIME

“ . . . The third time to pass into a prison for two years.”

III.—THE THIRD TIME

xvi.—THE TRIAL OF ALFRED TAYLOR

Proceedings on the Queen's Commission of Oyer and Terminer and Gaol Delivery for the City of London, and Gaol Delivery for the County of Middlesex and the parts of the Counties of Essex, Kent, and Surrey, within the jurisdiction of the Central Criminal Court, held on Monday, May 20th, 1895, and following days, before the Right Hon. Sir Joseph Renals, Knt., Lord Mayor of the City of London; Hon. Sir Charles Edward Pollock, Knt., Sir Alfred Wills, Knt., two of the Justices of Her Majesty's High Court; Sir Reginald Hanson, Bart., M.P., Sir Stuart Knill, Bart., Sir George Robert Tyler, Bart., Aldermen of the said City; Sir Charles Hall, Q.C., M.P., K.C.M.G., Recorder of the said City; George Faudel Phillips, Esq., Lieut.-Col. Horatio David Davies, Esq., Sir John Voce Moore, Knt., James Thomson Ritchie, Esq., Walter Vaughan Morgan, Esq., William Purdie Treloar, Esq., John Charles Bell, Esq., other of the Aldermen of the said City; and Sir Forrest Fulton, Knt., Q.C., Common Sergeant of the said City; Her Majesty's Justices of Oyer and Terminer and General Gaol Delivery, holden for the said City, and Judges of the Central Criminal Court; Marcus Samuel, Esq., Alderman, and George Hand, Esq., being Sheriffs; and Thomas George Beard, Esq., and Francis Robert Middleton Phillips, Esq., being Under-Sheriffs.

The Eighth Session of the Central Criminal Court under the Lord Mayoralty of Sir Joseph Renals, Knt., was opened at the Old Bailey on Monday, May 20th, 1895.

It is very unusual for a trial of any importance to begin on the first day of the Sessions. As a rule, the first two days are occupied by the Grand Jury in finding true bills and in the consideration of cases of minor importance by the Recorder and the Common Serjeant. Judges' cases are seldom reached before the third day, and then the judge whose name is first on the list leaves the High Court for the Old Bailey.

It was therefore by special arrangement that Mr. Justice Wills attended at the Central Criminal Court on the opening day of the Session to begin the second trial of Oscar Wilde and Alfred Taylor on the charges alleged against them under section xi. of the Criminal Law Amendment Act (1885), with regard to which charges the jury had been unable to arrive at a decision at the previous Sessions.

No fresh indictment having been preferred, it was not necessary for the case to be sent before a grand jury a second time. As a matter of fact, it will be seen that several counts had been removed from the indictment in addition to those on which a jury had already returned a verdict of Not Guilty. The Lord Mayor (Alderman Renals) opened the Commission, and the Recorder charged the Grand Jury in the Old Court. They were supported by the Sheriff and Aldermen in their robes of office. While the case against the accused had been reduced by the elimination of several counts in the indictment, and by the

disqualification of one of the witnesses, the prosecution had instructed the Solicitor-General himself (Sir Frank Lockwood, Q.C., M.P.) to take up the case on behalf of the Crown.

Punctually at eleven o'clock the usher of the court gave the signal, and Mr. Justice Wills, accompanied by the Lord Mayor and other civic functionaries, took his seat on the bench. Each carried the customary bouquet. On the Lord Mayor's right sat the Recorder, Sir Charles Hall; on the left were Sir Reginald Hanson, Sir Stuart Knill, Sir George Tyler, Sir J. Voce Moore, Mr. W. Morgan, and Sheriff Hand.

The Solicitor-General (Sir Frank Lockwood, Q.C., M.P.), with Mr. C. F. Gill and Mr. Horace Avory, appeared for the Public Prosecutor. Sir Edward Clarke, Q.C., M.P., with Mr. Charles Mathews and Mr. Travers Humphreys, defended Mr. Oscar Wilde; Mr. J. P. Grain and Mr. W. Clarke Hall were for Mr. Alfred Taylor.

Mr. H. Sutton, the Solicitor-General's Junior, and Mr. Angus Lewis and Mr. F. G. Frayling, Solicitors to the Treasury, were also present.

As the judge entered the court, Taylor was placed in the dock. Wilde, accompanied by his sureties, the Rev. Stewart Headlam and Lord Douglas of Hawick, at the same time came in by a door near the jury-box. Wilde appeared to look in somewhat better health than at the last trial, though his appearance was very different from what it was before his arrest. He seemed to have aged perceptibly, while traces of mental anxiety were noticeable on his features. For

a few moments he took a seat at the solicitors' table and held a whispered consultation with Mr. Charles Mathews. When the Clerk of Arraigns called out his name, Wilde stepped into the dock.

In the indictment Wilde, described as an author, forty years of age, was charged with committing acts of gross indecency with Edward Shelley, Alfred Wood, and Charles Parker; and further with committing similar acts with certain persons unknown. Taylor was charged with attempting to commit an "abominable crime" with William and with Charles Parker; with procuring and attempting the commission of certain acts of gross indecency with Alfred Wood; with attempting to procure the commission of those acts by Sidney Mavor; and with committing those acts with William and with Charles Parker.

Before the swearing in of the jury, Sir Edward Clarke said he had an application to make that the defendants might be tried separately.

Mr. Justice Wills:—Unless the Solicitor-General has anything to say—

The Solicitor-General:—I have, my lord.

Sir Edward Clarke replied that if the Solicitor-General were going to object, he would state at some length the grounds for his application. It was, he said, the prisoners' right to be tried separately. At the last trial there was an indictment for conspiracy, which had now been withdrawn, and there was no single count standing on the indictment on which both prisoners could be convicted. Sir Edward referred to a celebrated murder trial in which the learned Counsel, the Solicitor-General, made and

succeeded with the very same application, to the same judge, and in that same court.

Mr. Grain, on behalf of Taylor, concurred.

The Solicitor-General strenuously opposed the application. The case which Sir Edward Clarke had quoted was quite different—that was a felony. Sir Frank Lockwood pointed out that one of the counts charged Taylor with procuring certain persons to commit illegal acts with Wilde, and that the history of those cases was so bound up together that it was impossible to inquire into one without inquiring into the other. It was, therefore, he claimed, the fairest course towards the accused that there should be but one inquiry.

Sir Edward Clarke:—The chief ground on which my learned friend has opposed the separate trial of the defendants is that such a course would involve injustice to them. The best judges of that matter are those who have the responsibility of advising and representing the defendants, and we are of opinion that it would involve injustice to both if the prisoners were put upon their trial together. Therefore, I respectfully urge upon your lordship, it being clear that there is no one count in the indictment upon which both of the defendants can be convicted, that, in these circumstances, they are entitled to be tried separately.

His Lordship said that he had anticipated that application, and had already considered it carefully with regard to the evidence. He did not pretend he was entirely ignorant of the case. His own opinion was—though he did not put it higher than

an opinion—that it was much fairer that the defendants should be tried separately, and that that course was only right and proper.

The Solicitor-General:—As your lordship pleases. In that case, my lord, I propose to take the case of Taylor first.

Sir Edward Clarke at once objected on behalf of Wilde on the ground that his client would be prejudiced by having the case against Taylor heard first.

“I apply,” he said, “that the case of Mr. Wilde be taken first. His name stands first upon this indictment, and the first count is directed against him. There are reasons, I am sure, present to your lordship’s mind, why it would be unjust to Mr. Wilde that his case should be tried after, and immediately after, the trial of the other defendant.”

The Solicitor-General again raised an objection, and said that the prosecution could please itself in the matter.

The Judge:—It ought not to make any difference, Sir Edward. Certainly I—and I am sure the jury will—will do my very best to take care that one trial shall have no influence upon the other.

Sir Edward Clarke:—It ought not, my lord; it ought not, I know, to make any difference. I am sure the jury will try to do their duty. But there never was a time and a case in which that duty was more difficult to discharge, and I respectfully ask that as Mr. Wilde’s name stands first upon the indictment, and the first count concerns him, that his case be taken first.

His lordship then assured the learned Counsel that

whatever the result of the first trial might be, he and the jury would endeavour to insure that it should have no influence on the second. Moreover, it was, his lordship thought, within the rights of the prosecution to elect in what order the cases should be taken.

Sir Edward Clarke :—Then I make a further application, which I shall repeat at the end of Taylor's trial, and that is that Mr. Wilde's case may stand over till the next Sessions. And I am prepared to urge that upon your lordship.

His lordship said that application had better be postponed till the end of the first trial, adding, " If there should be an acquittal, so much the better for the other prisoner."

Sir Edward Clarke :—But in the meantime Mr. Wilde may be out on bail?

The Judge :—Certainly, if the bail are here.

The Solicitor-General having offered no objection, his lordship repeated that there was no reason for refusing the application, if the bail were present. If not, they could be sent for.

Mr. Wilde's sureties had left the court, but Sir Edward Clarke said that they should be sent for immediately. Until their return, Wilde was taken downstairs to the cells, and eventually quitted the precincts of the court about three o'clock.

THE TRIAL OF ALFRED TAYLOR

The Solicitor-General, in opening the case against Alfred Taylor, expressed a hope that the prisoner might have a most impartial trial. But the learned

Counsel believed such an appeal was absolutely and entirely unnecessary. He described Taylor as a young man of good family, who had been educated at one of the large Public Schools, and at his majority inherited a large sum of money. For a short time he had held a commission in a Militia regiment. But, apparently, his fortune being exhausted, for some time before the events with which the jury would have to deal, Taylor had followed no occupation of any sort or kind. Wilde was a man of literary attainments, a man who had achieved some distinction by his dramatic works. Apparently, at the time of which Counsel was speaking, Wilde had a house in Tite Street, Chelsea, in which he lived with his wife and children, and had also a sitting-room and a bedroom at the Savoy Hotel. Taylor had lived at 13, Little College Street, Westminster, and the first charge with which Counsel would deal was that Taylor attempted to procure the commission of certain acts by Mr. Oscar Wilde with Charles Parker. The Solicitor-General insisted that no false delicacy should be allowed to prevent the whole of the details of what actually took place from being laid before the jury. It was their right to know what did take place, and nothing ought to be left for them to guess.

Sir F. Lockwood then recapitulated the evidence given at Bow Street and at the previous trial at the Old Bailey by the witnesses Charles and William Parker as to the intimacy of themselves and Wood with Taylor and Wilde.

He entered with some minuteness into the circumstances under which Taylor became acquainted with

the Parkers—their meeting at the bar of the St. James's Restaurant, the visits of the two youths to Taylor's rooms in Little College Street, the peculiar character of those rooms, the introduction of the lads to Wilde at a restaurant near Piccadilly Circus, and the subsequent visit of Charles Parker to the Savoy Hotel in company with Wilde. The learned Counsel, after commenting parenthetically upon the hesitation he had in mentioning Wilde when Taylor alone was on his trial, went on to speak of Charles Parker's visits to Wilde's rooms in St. James's Place, of the stay of the Parkers at Taylor's apartments in Little College Street, and of Charles Parker's familiarity with Taylor when the latter had moved to Chapel Street. The stories of the Parkers, he held, were corroborated by Mrs. Grant, the caretaker of the house where Taylor had formerly lived; by a manservant from the rooms in St. James's Place, and by servants from the Savoy Hotel. It would also be shown that Taylor was in communication with Wilde. There were two telegrams from Wilde to Taylor, one running, "Could you call at six o'clock Savoy? Oscar," and the other, "Obliged to see Tree at five o'clock, so don't come to Savoy." There were other charges of offences committed by Taylor in respect of Charles and William Parker, and next they had the case of Alfred Wood associated with both Taylor and Wilde, Taylor acting as procurer.

CHARLES PARKER CALLED

Charles Parker was then called and sworn. He was being examined by Mr. C. F. Gill, when the

Judge pointed out that Counsel's questions were rather of a leading character.

Mr. Gill undertook to be careful not to put leading questions except in respect of evidence to which the witness had previously sworn.

The witness's evidence was taken rapidly, it being in reality a reading from the notes of evidence given at the former trial to which Parker had merely to say "Yes" or "No" as the case might be.

Witness told again the story of his meeting Taylor in the St. James's Restaurant, of his subsequent introduction to Wilde, of the supper party at the Florence, of the alleged visits with Wilde to the Savoy Hotel, and of the proceedings which were said to have taken place in Little College Street, where he and his brother stayed with Taylor for a few weeks. It was during that visit that Taylor had described how he dressed as a woman and went through a mock marriage with a youth named Charlie Mason. He denied that he had ever spoken to Wilde before he was introduced to him by Taylor at the restaurant where the four had dinner with champagne, liqueurs, and cigarettes.

Before concluding his evidence, the witness stated that after his arrest with Taylor in 1894 he made up his mind to leave London, and he enlisted.

His Lordship:—His arrest? On what charge?

Mr. Gill appeared uncomfortable at this question, and as the witness hesitated before giving an answer, the Judge added:—

I only want to know, you know. You leave the impression that there is something mysterious. What were you arrested for?

Witness :—For being in a house in Fitzroy Street.

Mr. Gill :—Really for being there with a felonious purpose. There were men there dressed as women.

His Lordship :—Then I suppose they were charged with consorting together to commit acts of indecency. Much better have the whole thing out.

Mr. Grain :—In that case, then, better at the same time have it out that both Taylor and Parker were discharged by the magistrate.

After describing further how Mr. Wilde took him about, gave him champagne dinners, and made him presents of money and jewellery, the witness was severely cross-examined by Mr. Grain.

In cross-examination the witness admitted that he had known a man named Harrington whose acquaintance also he had made at the bar of the St. James's Restaurant. But Harrington did not introduce him to Taylor, nor did any one introduce him to Harrington.

Mr. Grain :—Have you ever received hush-money?

Witness :—No.

Have you threatened to charge people with offences unless they paid you money?—No.

You know Wood and Allen?—Yes.

Be careful—you have been in that box before. Have you not already admitted receiving £30?—They did not tell me it was hush-money. They gave it to me.

That was just before you enlisted?—Yes.

Did either Allen or Wood tell you how they got it?—Yes; they said they got it out of a gentleman.

A gentleman with whom you had committed acts of indecency?—Yes.

Did you know a gentleman named Macklin?—No; but I have heard the name before. I have heard Taylor speak of him.

Did he not come to your rooms at Camera Square about May, 1894?—I never knew his name. At least, it did not sound like that. I know the man you mean.

Do you know a person named Clarke?—Yes.

Did Macklin tell you he had a number of letters belonging to Clarke?—Yes.

When he had hung up his coat in your room, did you not take those letters out of his pocket?—No.

Do you swear that?—Yes.

Did he not accuse you next day of having stolen his letters?—No; he gave me one of the letters.

One of Clarke's letters?—Yes.

What did you want one of Clarke's letters for?—I didn't want it. I gave it back.

Did you not go in June, 1894, about Whitsuntide, to Mr. Clarke and ask him for £10?—Yes.

Had you the letters with you?—No.

A letter?—No.

What did you want £10 for?—To go to America.

Where is Mr. Clarke now?—I don't know.

But why should Clarke give you £10?—He was the only friend I had in London. I had known him for three years.

His Lordship:—Who was Clarke?

Witness:—He was a silver-broker or something in the silver trade. He lived at 3, Northumberland

Mansions. At that time he worked for his brother-in-law, in Bond Street, but he is now out of the country.

Mr. Grain:—Did you not at that interview take Clarke's watch out of his pocket?—Never.

What? Was not a constable sent for?—I don't think a constable was sent for.

Did he threaten to charge you?—Not for that.

What do you mean by that?—Clarke said that his brother was coming, and that if I did not be off he would send for a constable.

You swear that you did not take his watch and chain, and that when the constable came you gave it up?—I do swear it.

Did he not threaten to charge you with stealing his gold watch and chain?—No.

The witness then denied that Clarke had introduced him to a man named Durnbach, or that he had ever threatened Clarke about letters he had written to Durnbach.

Witness knew Durnbach, and had been introduced to him, he said, by Taylor; and witness in turn had introduced Durnbach to Clarke. Witness had never demanded money from Durnbach. He told Taylor his father was a horse dealer at Dachet. That was true—“at least, he trained horses and that sort of thing.”

Mr. Grain then ceased cross-examination, being evidently satisfied with the admissions he had wrung out of the witness.

The Solicitor-General then briefly re-examined Charles Parker. Mr. Grain's last questions had

shown that Parker had been examined three times before he had said a word about Taylor. Sir Frank Lockwood tried to get that fact explained away; but in reply to the Solicitor-General's questions, the witness kept admitting that the third examination was not the first time he had been asked questions about Taylor. Throughout his occupancy of the box this wretched witness stood with a grin and a smirk upon his face. When he was asked about his arrest in Fitzroy Street, one would have thought from looking at him that the reminiscence was a most pleasant one, and similarly with many other of the incidents he related. As the case went on, astonishment and wonder grew how it was possible for the Crown to demean itself by relying on the evidence of such creatures.

Mr. Gill had evidently been anxious that the story of his witness's arrest in Fitzroy Street should be passed over, for Counsel asked merely: "In August, 1894, something happened to you and Taylor?" but the Judge interfered, saying that he did not want any mystery about it, and the witness was reluctantly compelled to admit what had taken place.

WILLIAM PARKER CALLED

William Parker, elder brother of the last witness, generally corroborated the evidence of Charles Parker, about their being introduced to Mr. Wilde, and of the latter's selection of the witness's brother as "the boy for me." He also gave positive evidence alleging misconduct of a grave character with Taylor.

Cross-examined:—He had been out of employment for about a fortnight when he made Taylor's acquaintance. He knew Taylor only for a few weeks.

The Solicitor-General asked the Judge whether there was any hope of finishing the case that day. His lordship replied that he meant to try to conclude that day, and for that reason he suggested that the luncheon interval should be curtailed.

ALFRED WOOD CALLED

After the adjournment, Alfred Wood, the young man who obtained money from Wilde in exchange for letters in his possession belonging to Lord Alfred Douglas, was put into the box and examined by the Solicitor-General. The examination of Wood consisted chiefly, in the early part, of questions as to his relation with Wilde.

Witness then described again his acquaintance with Taylor and his visits to the rooms in Little College Street. It was not at all clear, however, that Taylor was responsible, at least directly, for the introduction of the witness to Mr. Wilde, as the indictment suggested. Mr. Grain objecting, the witness was not allowed to say what had taken place between himself and Mr. Wilde, as the introduction was brought about through Lord Alfred Douglas, and was not made by Taylor.

Sir F. Lockwood then began to examine the witness in a way that led the Judge to interrupt him.

His Lordship:—I suppose the purport of this

evidence is to show that Wilde was anxious to get Wood out of the way?

The Solicitor-General:—Yes; and that he paid money to do it.

The witness, Alfred Wood, then went on to state that to enable him to go to America Mr. Wilde had given him £30.

The Solicitor-General:—From whom came the telegram, in consequence of which you went to the Café Royal to meet Mr. Wilde?—From Lord Alfred Douglas.

His Lordship:—Had you any acquaintance with Lord Alfred Douglas at the time when you first met Mr. Wilde?—Yes.

The Solicitor-General:—Where had you met Lord Alfred Douglas first?—At Taylor's rooms, in Little College Street.

Who introduced you to him?—No one. He came up to me and shook hands with me.

The Judge, upon this, said that the evidence of procuration against Taylor seemed no stronger than it might be against three or four other persons. Lord Alfred Douglas, and not Taylor, being the introducer, evidence as to Wilde's conduct was no evidence against Taylor. Something more than Wood's introduction to Taylor by Wilde must be proved; there must be direct evidence, if any, of a criminal motive on the part of Wilde.

The witness Wood was therefore ordered to stand down.

His lordship further ruled that evidence given at the previous trial by the chambermaid at the Savoy

Hotel could not be taken as evidence against Taylor.

OTHER WITNESSES CALLED

Mrs. Grant, the caretaker at 13, Little College Street, described again the furnishing and decorations of Taylor's rooms in that house. She repeated in detail all the evidence she had previously given.

Cross-examined:—She did not tell Taylor that the police had been to make inquiries about him.

Jane Margaret Cotter, a chambermaid from the Savoy Hotel, was proceeding to speak as to the circumstances attending Wilde's stay at the Savoy in March, 1893, when

Mr. Grain objected on the ground that his client had nothing to do with anything that might or might not have taken place at the Savoy Hotel.

The Solicitor-General said it was desired merely to give some corroboration of Charles Parker's evidence.

The Judge held that the Solicitor-General's view was justified, and the examination proceeded, but no new facts were elicited.

Emile Becker, a witness who had not previously been called, a waiter at the Savoy Hotel, proved that Mr. Oscar Wilde and Lord Alfred Douglas were staying at the hotel in March, 1893. He stated that after Lord Alfred Douglas had left the hotel, where he occupied a room next to Mr. Wilde's, Mr. Wilde had been visited by other young men.

Mrs. Gray, landlady, of 3, Chapel Street, Chelsea, deposed that Taylor stayed in her house from

evidence is to show that Wilde was anxious to get Wood out of the way?

The Solicitor-General:—Yes; and that he paid money to do it.

The witness, Alfred Wood, then went on to state that to enable him to go to America Mr. Wilde had given him £30.

The Solicitor-General:—From whom came the telegram, in consequence of which you went to the Café Royal to meet Mr. Wilde?—From Lord Alfred Douglas.

His Lordship:—Had you any acquaintance with Lord Alfred Douglas at the time when you first met Mr. Wilde?—Yes.

The Solicitor-General:—Where had you met Lord Alfred Douglas first?—At Taylor's rooms, in Little College Street.

Who introduced you to him?—No one. He came up to me and shook hands with me.

The Judge, upon this, said that the evidence of procuration against Taylor seemed no stronger than it might be against three or four other persons. Lord Alfred Douglas, and not Taylor, being the introducer, evidence as to Wilde's conduct was no evidence against Taylor. Something more than Wood's introduction to Taylor by Wilde must be proved; there must be direct evidence, if any, of a criminal motive on the part of Wilde.

The witness Wood was therefore ordered to stand down.

His lordship further ruled that evidence given at the previous trial by the chambermaid at the Savoy

Hotel could not be taken as evidence against Taylor.

OTHER WITNESSES CALLED

Mrs. Grant, the caretaker at 13, Little College Street, described again the furnishing and decorations of Taylor's rooms in that house. She repeated in detail all the evidence she had previously given.

Cross-examined:—She did not tell Taylor that the police had been to make inquiries about him.

Jane Margaret Cotter, a chambermaid from the Savoy Hotel, was proceeding to speak as to the circumstances attending Wilde's stay at the Savoy in March, 1893, when

Mr. Gray objected on the ground that his client had nothing to do with anything that might or might not have taken place at the Savoy Hotel.

The Solicitor-General said it was desired merely to give some corroboration of Charles Parker's evidence.

The Judge held that the Solicitor-General's view was justified, and the examination proceeded, but no new facts were elicited.

Emile Becker, a witness who had not previously been called, a waiter at the Savoy Hotel, proved that Mr. Oscar Wilde and Lord Alfred Douglas were staying at the hotel in March, 1893. He stated that after Lord Alfred Douglas had left the hotel, where he occupied a room next to Mr. Wilde's, Mr. Wilde had been visited by other young men.

Mrs. Gray, landlady, of 3, Chapel Street, Chelsea, deposed that Taylor stayed in her house from

August, 1893, to the end of that year. She stated that Charles Parker used to come there to see him.

OPENING OF THE DEFENCE

Formal evidence of quite an unimportant nature concluded the case for the prosecution of Taylor, and Mr. Grain proceeded to open his defence.

He urged that so far as the case against Taylor went there was an almost entire absence of corroboration.

The Solicitor-General, on the other hand, contended that there was ample corroboration to go to the jury on.

His lordship held that there was sufficient corroborative evidence to get rid of any technical difficulty, and he thought it better there should be a verdict, for reasons which would appear in his summing up.

Mr. Grain thereupon began his address to the jury. He asked the jury to believe that it was impossible for a young man of the prisoner's education and family connections to commit the offences with which he was charged—unless he was out of his mind. The statements of the two Parkers, Counsel contended, could not be accepted, because those witnesses were, by their own confession, accomplices in the acts; and a man could not be convicted of such offences on the uncorroborated evidence of accomplices. Moreover, one accomplice could not, the law said, corroborate another accomplice. There was really no independent corroborative evidence, and when he had called

his client, and he had denied all the allegations, as he would do, Counsel should ask the jury to acquit the accused. A great deal had been made of the way in which Taylor had furnished and decorated his rooms, but they were decorated only as a young man of taste might be expected to decorate his bachelor apartments.

No doubt Taylor had been a very unwise young man, but it did not follow that he had been a criminal. He was the son of a man of property and of high commercial position, whose business was still being carried on successfully as a limited company. Educated at Marlborough and by private tutors, he had tried his best to get a commission in the Army through the Militia. Unfortunately for him, he succeeded too early to the uncontrolled possession of a large fortune left him by his father and his uncle. Being thus led into habits of idleness and extravagance, and into what Mr. Grain would at once admit was a more or less vicious mode of life, the result was the common one—he soon spent the whole of his money and a great deal more, so that in the course of the previous year he had found himself in the Bankruptcy Court. But Mr. Grain found it incredible that a man beginning life under such favourable auspices should be guilty of those unmentionable acts. There was not a suggestion that Taylor had reaped a single penny of advantage. The evidence against him was the tainted evidence of young men who, on their own admissions, might have been placed in the dock instead of Taylor, or by his side.

At this point Mr. Grain announced that he would put his client into the witness-box on the opening of the court on the following morning, and the hearing was adjourned for the day.

**xvii.—SECOND DAY OF THE TRIAL OF ALFRED
TAYLOR**

On Tuesday, May 21st, the trial of Alfred Taylor at the Old Bailey was continued. Mr. Oscar Wilde was not in court, but Sir Edward Clarke was there, as on the previous day. Though the learned Counsel's presence was not really essential, as he was not engaged in the trial of Taylor, he was present to watch the case on his client's behalf, very closely and devotedly, as he had from the beginning. Indeed, more than once, when he felt that the prosecution was making an unfair use of Mr. Wilde's name, he seemed to be on the point of rising to protest.

The court was again densely crowded, but not to such an extent as when Lord Queensberry or Wilde himself was in the dock. The Counsel engaged in the case were early in attendance, and almost up to the last moment before the day's proceedings opened, those representing the Crown, Sir Frank Lockwood, Q.C., Mr. C. F. Gill, Mr. Horace Avory, and Mr. H. Sutton, were in close consultation with the Treasury solicitors, the Hon. Hamilton Cuffe (Director of Crown Prosecutions), Mr. Angus Lewis, and Mr. F. G. Frayling. Mr. G. P. Grain was at the same time conversing with his client over the dock.

Taylor looked little the worse for his detention at Holloway awaiting trial. In the witness-box his attitude created a favourable impression, as he gave

his replies readily and frankly and with every appearance of truth. During the morning the Marquis of Queensberry came into court, for the first time since his own acquittal, and was given a seat in the pew reserved for friends of the Corporation. He was described in one newspaper a day or two later as "the creature who flaunted about in and out of the Old Bailey, with yellow roses in his button-hole and his hat stuck airily upon the end of his walking-stick."

ALFRED TAYLOR IN THE WITNESS-BOX

As soon as Mr. Justice Wills had taken his seat, Alfred Taylor was called. Passing from the dock into the witness-box, he was sworn. Being examined by Mr. Grain, he stated that he was thirty-three years of age, the son of the late Mr. Henry Taylor, who was the manufacturer of "an article of food in large demand." He was educated at Marlborough School, and leaving at the age of seventeen, he went to a private tutor at Preston, near Brighton. In 1882 he joined a Militia regiment, with the intention of seeking a commission in the Army. In 1883 he came of age, and succeeded under his father's will to a fortune of £45,000. He thereupon abandoned his military ambition, and began a life of pleasure in town, which ended in his being made bankrupt. In 1893 he was living in Little College Street, but it was absolutely untrue that there or anywhere else he had committed any act of indecency either with Charles or William Parker. And certainly he did not procure either of those persons to commit indecencies with Mr. Oscar Wilde.

The examination concluded with these questions :
Is it true that at Little College Street you committed any acts of indecency?—Absolutely untrue.

After the committal of the Marquis of Queensberry to this court were you seen by ex-detective Little-child?—Yes.

Were you afterwards served with a subpoena to attend this court?—Yes, and I was here in the court the whole of the time.

Taylor was then cross-examined by the Solicitor-General.

The Solicitor-General :—Since you left the Militia have you had any fixed occupation?

Witness :—No.

How long did you live in Little College Street?—Mrs. Grant would tell you the exact date. I fancy it was about a year and a half.

There was only one bed in your rooms there?—Yes.

And you had from time to time young men calling upon you?—Yes; I have several friends.

Boys?—Eighteen to twenty-one, if you call those boys.

Boys of sixteen? So young as that?—I don't remember any one as young as sixteen, except Mrs. Grant's children, who brought up my milk in the morning.

Did Charles Mason stay with you?—Yes, for about a week when I first went there in 1892.

How old is he?—He is now twenty-six or twenty-seven.

How did you address him?—As “ Dear Charlie.”

In writing to him did you send him your love?—
Yes, I generally do.

When you are writing to a young man?—It depends who the man is. If he is a great friend of mine, I might say “With love” or “Yours affectionately,” or something of that sort.

And that is how Mason would address you?—I suppose so.

Do you remember going through a form of marriage with Mason?—No, never.

Did you not tell Parker that you had?—Nothing of the kind.

No burlesque ceremony?—No, nothing.

Did he sleep in the same bed with you?—Yes.

Were you on terms of affection with him?—I don’t understand your question. If you mean did I commit acts of indecency, I did not.

I did not use that term.—I knew him very well. He was a great friend of mine.

Had you any articles of women’s dress in your rooms?—Only an Eastern costume.

A woman’s costume?—It was made for a woman. I wore it.

On what occasions did you figure in this fancy attire?—Oh, carnivals, and so on.

On what occasions?—At fancy dress balls, at the carnivals at Olympia, at Covent Garden, and at Queen’s Gate Hall.

You dressed as a woman?—Hardly that. I wore knickerbockers and stockings under a long open cloak, which was fastened at the waist.

And a woman’s wig?—No; the wig was made for

a ball to which I went dressed as Dick Whittington.
Woman's stockings?—Yes.

How many different men have shared your bedroom?—Must I give you all my friends' names?

Yes, sir, you must.—May I write them down?

No, sir, you may tell us them. I will have no names suppressed if I can help it.

Witness (to the Judge): My lord, I would prefer to write them on a piece of paper.

The Solicitor-General:—We will have no names kept back if I can help it.

His Lordship:—If you write it I shall read it out. I don't approve of mystery in cases of this kind. It is sometimes done good-naturedly and great mischief is caused. It is supposed that there is some kind of mystery, and that Judge and everybody else are in a kind of conspiracy. We will have nothing of that kind.

The Solicitor-General:—I am very much obliged to your lordship for taking that view.

The witness thereupon, with some hesitation, recalled the names of Mason, the two Parkers, and Sidney Mavor. Being pressed further he added the name of Harrington. The Solicitor-General urged him to disclose more names.

Witness:—Must I mention my other friend's name?

The Solicitor-General:—Yes.

Witness then mentioned the name of Ernest Macklin. He had met him first at his mother's house.

The Solicitor-General:—Where was that?

Witness:—Must I say?

No, never mind; I will spare your mother that. Did Macklin ever sleep with you at Little College Street?—No, never.

Can't you remember any others?—I'm trying to think. Perhaps you can help me if you have the names.

You say that you did not accost the Parkers, but that Harrington introduced you to them?—Yes.

Did you offer the Parkers a drink at that first meeting?—They stood a drink and I retaliated.

After Harrington had introduced them?—He was living with them. Harrington and the Parkers came up to the bar at the same time as I did.

What were you doing there?—I was having a drink after the theatre.

Following your usual custom of doing nothing?—Yes, if that's what you call doing nothing.

Did you not give your address to the Parkers on the occasion of your first meeting them at the St. James's bar?—No.

Where is Harrington now?—I do not know.

Here?—Probably, very probably, for all I know.

The Solicitor-General:—Call Harrington.

Harrington was called by the ushers of the court, and he came in.

The Solicitor-General:—Is that Harrington?

Witness:—Yes.

You did not know he was here, did you?—Yes; I imagined you had him here to be called.

Where and when did you first meet Harrington?—At the house of a man named Court in July, 1892.

What was Court?—He was a schoolmaster.

What was the attraction about Harrington?—I don't know what his attraction was.

Did you take Harrington to the Tivoli?—No.

Why did he stay with you on Saturday and Sunday?—Oh, I asked him.

Did you take him the same night to a restaurant in Victoria Street?—Not the same night. I never took him at all. It was my friend.

Who is your friend?—Must I mention his name?

Yes, you must.—Schwabe.*

That is the person you say introduced Wilde to you?—Yes.

Was it not a man named Harold Henry?—I think you are right. It was. I have dined with Schwabe and Harrington, but it was on another occasion.

Who is Henry?—A musician; a clerk in a music publisher's at Putney.

Have you slept with him?—Yes; he was staying with me at the time.

He was in your bedroom?—Yes; whenever my friends came to see me they always saw all the rooms because they were rather interested in them.

The witness denied positively that he had been guilty of impropriety with Harrington.

Mr. Grain took objection to the question being raised with regard to a man who had not been called in the case.

His lordship held that as cross-examination to character the question was relevant.

* Schwabe, it will be remembered, was a nephew of the Solicitor-General.

Taylor throughout his cross-examination defended himself in a wonderful manner. His position in any view one may take of him, was a terrible one, and he had against him one of the most astute lawyers and subtle cross-examiners of the day. Yet, despite this, Taylor gave his answers in a manner which could not but have made considerable impression on the jury.

The Solicitor-General next went into Taylor's acquaintance with the Parkers. The witness adhered to what he had previously stated, namely, that he was introduced to the Parkers by Harrington in the bar of the St. James's Restaurant, and that he invited the Parkers to his rooms because he found them very nice.

Did you know that Charles Parker had been a gentleman's servant?—I knew it afterwards, but I did not know it at the time.

When did you hear that William Parker had been a groom?—Not until the trial.

On the occasion of leaving the Parkers at the St. James's Restaurant, did you invite them to visit you at Little College Street?—I cannot remember.

What was the attraction about them?—They were very nice.

The Solicitor-General:—In what way "very nice"? Nice looking?—No; pleasant spoken and amusing.

How came it about that those two young fellows went to your house on the first occasion?—They came to see me.

They came in the morning. They were staying with me at the time of the dinner. They came to me when they left Hunter Street, Brunswick Square.

They asked me if I could put them up for a week, and I did so. Ultimately I persuaded William Parker to go home to his father. Charles Parker determined to remain in London. After a few weeks he went away to Paris with a gentleman, and stayed in Paris about five months. Witness saw him only once after that.

At this time were you in communication with Oscar Wilde?—I used to go to see him at the Savoy. I told him the Parkers were staying with me when he asked me to dinner.

Did you receive this telegram dated March 7th, 1893: "Could you call at six o'clock Savoy, Oscar"?—Yes.

And this one: "Obliged to see Tree at five o'clock, so don't come to Savoy. Let me know at once about Fred"?—Yes.

I suppose "Fred" means Fred Atkins?—Yes.

Did you take the Parkers to dine with Wilde at a restaurant?—Yes.

When you first met them did you mention the name of Oscar Wilde?—No, not on that occasion.

Did you say that Oscar Wilde had lots of money?—Not then.

When?—Not at any time, because I don't think he had.

Did you say he was fond of boys?—I may have said that he was fond of young people—that he liked their society. I did not put it in the way you mean.

Taylor stated in answer to further questions that he met the young fellows afterwards at the Alhambra, the Empire, the Pavilion, and the St. James's Restaurant.

The Solicitor-General:—Who paid?—These are not free institutions.

Witness:—We all paid for ourselves. I was not in a position to pay for other people.

Did you use to meet them in Piccadilly?—No, no.

They walked along Piccadilly?—I know what you are insinuating.

I am insinuating that you walked Piccadilly.—I frequently walked through Piccadilly.

As to the charge of procuring the Parkers for immoral purposes, the Solicitor-General cross-examined the witness closely to show that Mr. Wilde had never set eyes on them until Taylor took them to dine with him at the restaurant in Soho.

The Solicitor-General:—Why did you take the Parkers to dinner with Mr. Wilde?

Witness:—Mr. Wilde asked me to dinner, as it was my birthday. The Parkers happened to be staying with me. I said so, and Mr. Wilde told me to bring them along with me.

There were four of you at table—Oscar Wilde, yourself, the ex-groom, and the ex-valet?—Yes.

Why did you take them?—They were my friends. Charlie Parker wanted to go on the stage. I thought Mr. Oscar Wilde would be a useful man to help them.

Your friends of a fortnight?—You might say three weeks. The party was of a convivial nature. We all laughed a good deal.

At the humours of the Parkers?—No, at the humours of Mr. Wilde.

Oh, so it was Oscar Wilde who was amusing, not the Parkers?—Yes. It amused him to amuse us.

Did you hear him say that Charles Parker was the boy for him?—No, I did not.

Did Charles Parker leave the restaurant with Mr. Wilde?—No.

Up to that point the story of the Parkers is true?—Yes, up to that point.

And from that point?—The Parkers went with me into the St. James's and had drinks, and then both went with me to Westminster and slept at my place.

You say that distinctly?—I do.

Taylor denied the truth of the whole story told by the Parkers as to the events subsequent to the dinner.

How did Charles Parker live?—At that time I understood that he had an allowance from his father.

Then why were you keeping him at your house?—Oh, his father wouldn't give him any money then.

You did not know that he was penniless?—No.

Except for what he got from the gentlemen he met?—Ah, I didn't know of that.

Where was Parker living at the time of the arrest at Fitzroy Square?—At 72, Regent Street, Chelsea.

With Wood?—I think so.

How came you to go to Fitzroy Square?—It was by Parker's invitation. He had two tickets. I supposed it was a night club, and that a ball was on.

Did you see men there dressed as women?—No.

Did you see them outside the house?—No.

After the arrests did you see Marling at the police station?—Yes.

What was Marling?—I understood that he was a betting man.

In answer to further questions, Taylor said he had

first met Arthur Marling at the Knightsbridge Skating Rink, and had been introduced to him by a young man named Scarfe, whom he understood to have just returned from the gold diggings. Taylor introduced Scarfe to Mr. Wilde at 10, St. James's Place. He did not know him to be the son of a domestic servant. Marling was one of the men arrested at the raid in Fitzroy Square. He did not then know him to be a man of notorious character, but he had heard it since.*

When did you first make the acquaintance of Alfred Wood?—In May, 1892.

Where?—At Atkins's rooms in Alderney Street.

Witness declared that he had never dined or lunched with Wood and Mr. Wilde together.

Witness further denied all knowledge of the introduction of Wood to Mr. Wilde. He was lunching at the Florence one day, he continued, and saw Mr. Wilde, Schwabe, and Wood coming downstairs from a private room. He remembered Mr. Wilde giving Wood money to go to America, but he did not think it was blackmail or that the money was demanded for the return of Mr. Wilde's letters—“which were of no value,” he added.

The Solicitor-General:—What is Mavor?

* At the Central Criminal Court, before the Common Sergeant (Sir Forrest Fulton), on March 9th, 1897, Arthur Marling, alias Goff, was (with another man) sentenced to five years' penal servitude for receiving stolen goods. The evidence showed that it was a case of blackmail. Inspector McCarthy said that Marling, who was arrested in the New Inn, Edgware Road, on January 10th previously, was addicted to indecent and unnatural practices. The charge against Marling was connected with that for which Cliburn and Allen were subsequently sentenced. (See page 56, footnote.)

Witness:—A gentleman. I dined with him the night I was introduced to Mr. Wilde.

What is your definition of a gentleman?—He had private means.

What is Mason?—He also is a gentleman in that sense. He is connected with a newspaper, and is a very busy man.

That is rather a vague description.—Well, he possesses a number of shares in a newspaper. I have known him and Macklin for many years. He was a very old friend of mine. I had known him from boyhood.

Amongst the papers found in the hat-box which Taylor's landlady had given to a detective was the following letter which the Solicitor-General read:—

144, Fleet Street,
November 1, 1891.

MY DEAR ALFRED,

As soon as you can afford it do let me have some money and I shall be pleased and obliged. I would not ask you if I could get any myself, but you know the business is not so easy. There is a lot of trouble attached to it. I have not met any one yet. Come home soon, dear, and let us go out sometimes together. Have very little news. Going to a dance on Monday and to the theatre to-night.

With much love,
Yours always, CHARLIE.

The Solicitor-General:—What is the explanation of those words, "Come home soon, dear," used between two men?

Witness:—I don't see anything in it. Anyhow, I

am not responsible for the expressions of another. It's the way you read it.

Then read it yourself, sir, and tell me if that is the kind of language you exchange with the men who were on such intimate terms with you that they slept in your bed.—I don't see anything in that.

Sir Edward Clarke who was watching the case in the interests of Mr. Oscar Wilde, moved in his seat as if to rise, and appeared to say a few words which were inaudible to those in court.

The Solicitor-General, taking Sir Edward Clarke's remark for an interference, turned to him and exclaimed: "You are not engaged in this case."

Mr. Grain:—But I—

The Solicitor-General (to the witness):—Do you call it a proper letter, sir?—I think it is a perfectly proper letter, seeing the very long friendship which had existed between us. But, remember, I did not write the letter.

His Lordship:—In this letter written to you by Mason, how do you explain the passage, "I have not met anyone yet"?—He had been expecting someone to help him get work.

You are an old Public School boy. Was it not repugnant to your Public School ideas, this habit of sleeping with men?—Not to me. Where there is no harm done I see nothing repugnant in it.

Re-examined by Mr. Grain:—Since his bankruptcy one of his brothers had been allowing him a certain sum of money. "A very small sum," witness added, with a smile.

The witness then left the box and returned to the

dock. It was generally admitted that he had gone through his cross-examination well, and that Counsel had not succeeded in getting anything from him in the nature of a direct admission.

MR. GRAIN ADDRESSES THE JURY FOR THE DEFENCE

Mr. Grain said he thought his client had emerged almost triumphantly from a trying ordeal, and that the jury would have no further doubt, adding Taylor's denials on oath to the inherent improbabilities of the case, in finding him not guilty of the charges—charges which were supported only by the tainted evidence of men, every one of whom had left the witness-box a self-confessed criminal. Counsel relied, in short, on the undoubted fact that there was no direct independent corroboration. He contended that there was not the slightest corroboration of any kind of the statements of the lads Parker, and the jury ought not to convict on their statements alone, as they were tainted witnesses. With regard to the charge of procuring, Counsel submitted that the prosecution had altogether failed to make out a case. He argued that when a man or a woman took to the abominable business of procuring young persons for immoral purposes, they did so for gain. But in this case there had never been any suggestion that Taylor had ever received money from Mr. Oscar Wilde. It had not been shown that he had extracted one penny piece from anyone in respect of the crimes imputed to him, and consequently there was no motive disclosed.

Speaking of the tactics of the Solicitor-General in

suddenly and dramatically calling Harrington into the court to confront Taylor, Counsel said that, as a humble member of the Bar, he could not dictate, but he must say that if that was a fair and just method for a Counsel of the Crown to adopt, he was very sorry. The detail of the Solicitor-General's cross-examination was remarkable, and Taylor's evidence under those circumstances compared admirably with the tainted evidence produced by the Crown. Taylor had made no attempt to fly from justice, though he had had ample opportunity for so doing, and his whole demeanour was incompatible with that of a guilty man. Had he acceded to ex-Inspector Littlechild's request, he would not have been in the dock, but would be a witness for the Crown. In conclusion, Counsel begged the jury to clear their minds of all preconceived notions, and to give the accused the benefit of every reasonable doubt.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL REPLIES FOR THE
PROSECUTION

Sir Frank Lockwood then replied upon the whole case. He went minutely through the evidence, and submitted that the corroboration was as strong as it well could be in a case of this sort. If stronger corroboration were needed for a conviction, he was afraid that this terrible vice would rear its head in our midst unchecked. How could there be direct independent corroboration? Of its very nature that thing was done secretly. He treated it as an accepted fact that Taylor's rooms in Little College Street were "a place

taken in this secluded street as a place where persons who had these filthy appetites might meet and gratify them." For what honest purpose, Counsel asked, could the ill-assorted dinner-parties at Kettner's have been brought together?

Some remarks of Counsel as to the evidence of a Savoy Hotel waiter, in the previous trial, caused Mr. Grain to protest that it would be impossible for him to call Mr. Wilde to give evidence for Taylor, Wilde himself awaiting trial at that moment.

To this the Solicitor-General replied, " You could not be expected to call Mr. Oscar Wilde. I shall tell the jury that."

Sir Frank Lockwood continued that he agreed with Mr. Grain as to the grave nature of the charge and the responsibility that lay upon himself (the Solicitor-General) in having to establish the charges that had been made. But he had listened patiently to the remarks as to the character of the evidence. What kind of corroboration did his learned friend expect to be produced? If the prosecution were bound to produce direct evidence, they would be powerless to check this vice. They were asked not to believe Charles Parker because he had been mixed up with blackmailing; but was there one word to suggest that Parker had ever attempted to blackmail Taylor or ever attempted to blackmail Mr. Wilde? What had Parker to gain, and how much had he got to lose by the story he had told? Though they would be shunned and loathed, yet it had not been able to be shown that they had gained one penny or had any object in coming to the court.

At half-past one, before the Solicitor-General had finished his speech for the prosecution, the court adjourned for luncheon. Twenty minutes after the resumption of the sitting, Sir F. Lockwood brought his address to a somewhat sudden end. Having gone entirely through the evidence, he told the jury that if they came to the conclusion that the story of the Parkers was true, they were not to shrink from giving a verdict of guilty. •

THE JUDGE'S SUMMING UP

Mr. Justice Wills began his summing up to the jury shortly before half-past two. His lordship dealt first with the abstract question of the need of corroboration of evidence in such a case. In charges of such a dreadful character, his lordship said, there would be a great terror added to life if the rule were not observed as to the necessity of insisting on independent corroboration. "If," he continued, "I had not thought that in respect of all these charges there was corroborative evidence fit to be submitted to you in respect of each one of these, which did not depend on the testimony of these accomplices, I should most undoubtedly have stopped the case. The weight of such corroboration is entirely a question for you, gentlemen of the jury."

His lordship proceeded to point out that the greater part of the evidence, up to the point where indecency was alleged, was admitted; and it was evidence that showed an association between men of education an'

position with uneducated men-servants which was certainly remarkable. The Parkers had declared that improper conduct took place, and in his lordship's opinion there was sufficient corroboration to warrant the case going to the jury. It was for them to say whether in their opinion it was corroboration that should weigh with them. It might very well be that although there was evidence proper to be left to the jury, they might not think it sufficient to justify conviction. There could be no doubt that the Parkers were introduced to Wilde by Taylor; but as to the charge of procuration, the question divided itself into two heads: the introduction and the object of it. But unless the jury thought this introduction of the Parkers by Taylor to Wilde led to the consequences alleged, it was nothing, and if it led to such consequences without Taylor's knowledge it was equally nothing. And unless the jury were satisfied as to the subsequent stories told by Charles Parker, the introduction amounted to nothing. God forbid that he (the learned Judge) should for a moment entertain the thought that for a man to give another a supper—no matter how greatly removed socially they were—was sufficient ground for suspicion; nay, not even though the one gave money to the other.

If Mr. Wilde knew that these young Parkers were sharing the same bed with Taylor, it was a strange thing that a man of his education should have admitted them, or even Taylor, to his intimacy. Knowing, too, what they did about the life and manners of this country, was not the giving of such a dinner to such young men sufficient to give founda-

tion for such a story as was now told? But the suspicious part of the incident was denied by Taylor; and it was for the jury to decide for themselves whether the Parkers were to be believed or Taylor.

After analysing all the evidence, his lordship said there was a strong line of demarcation between his duty and the duty of the jury. It would be an ill day for the administration of justice when juries did not act and think for themselves. He would say that he was absolutely impartial, having no thought but to strive to do his duty; and anything that he had said that might seem either for one side or the other they would discard. The jury must judge for themselves whether the evidence was conclusive or not.

The counts upon which the jury would have to give a verdict, his lordship concluded, were those charging the prisoner with procuring the Parkers for Wilde, and those alleging indecent behaviour by the prisoner towards the Parkers. The other count, which charged Taylor with procuring Wood, must fail; because it had been shown that Wood's introduction to Mr. Wilde did not take place through Taylor.

Concluding his remarks, the learned Judge said that he did not remember a case which had given him more trouble and anxious care. If the jury had any reasonable doubt as to the prisoner's guilt, he was entitled to the benefit of it; if, on the other hand, they believed the charges had been satisfactorily proved, they had but one duty, though it was a sad one, to perform.

THE VERDICT

The jury retired at twenty minutes past three to consider their verdict. After an absence of about three-quarters of an hour they returned into court and asked his lordship for further instructions upon the counts charging the prisoner with procuration. The foreman of the jury said that they were not agreed as to the wording of the counts as placed before them by the Judge.

His lordship said he thought the best thing to do was to write down for them the exact words of the particular counts in the indictment to which the jury referred. When his lordship had done so, he inquired whether the jury were agreed upon the other counts. The foreman replying that they were agreed, his lordship said he thought it would be sufficient to take their verdict upon those counts. He thought he need not trouble the jury with respect to the other counts, but asked whether the Solicitor-General were in attendance.

Mr. Avory:—I have sent for him, my lord.

Mr. Justice Wills:—I cannot see any earthly reason for dealing with the other counts, but I will wait and hear what the Solicitor-General has to say.

Immediately afterwards Sir Frank Lockwood came into court, and, after consulting with Mr. Gill, said that as far as the prosecution was concerned they would take the verdict given by the jury upon two counts.

Mr. Grain, on behalf of Taylor, offered no objection.

The Judge said he supposed the jury could be discharged with regard to the second and third counts —those of procuring.

The Solicitor-General:—Yes, my lord.

The jury then stated, through their foreman, that they found a verdict of Guilty on the count alleging indecency against Taylor with Charles Parker, and also upon the count charging him with indecency with William Parker.

At his lordship's direction the jury returned a verdict of Not Guilty on the count charging Taylor with procuring Wood. The jury were discharged from giving a verdict on the counts for procuring the two Parkers.

The Judge announced that he would postpone sentence until after the charges against Wilde had been heard, and the prisoner was removed to the cells. Taylor moistened his lips with his tongue when the verdict of Guilty was pronounced, but otherwise betrayed not the slightest feeling, and left the dock with firm steps.

Sir Edward Clarke:—With regard to the case of the other defendant. Mr. Wilde is here in attendance, of course; but it is getting late, and, perhaps, after a second jury has disagreed in this matter—

The Solicitor-General:—I must object to my learned friend taking this opportunity of making these little speeches.

The Judge:—You can hardly call it a disagreement, Sir Edward. If it is material to go on at once with this case I should not for a moment think of

discharging the jury, and should have kept them here for two or three hours more.

The Solicitor-General :—It was merely the expectancy that some such use might be attempted to be made of the decision that caused me, even for a moment, to hesitate to take the verdict, but I was perfectly satisfied that the verdict should be entered.

The Judge (to Sir Edward Clarke) :—Do you say you prefer it should be taken to-morrow morning?

Sir Edward Clarke :—I am quite content to proceed now if the Crown is going on—but with a different jury, of course.

The Judge :—I think we ought to have another jury.

The Solicitor-General :—I think, perhaps, my lord, it would be better that we should commence it to-morrow morning.

The Judge :—Very well. I may repeat what I said yesterday, that I was most anxious to keep these two cases separate, and in these circumstances, gentlemen, having heard the evidence in this case, I think it is most proper, in the interest of securing a fair trial, that you should not try the next case, and that it should be heard by a jury from the next court who have heard nothing in this case at all.

It was therefore agreed that the case of Mr. Oscar Wilde should be begun on the following (Wednesday) morning, and that another jury should be empanelled to try it.

Wilde had been in attendance during the day, waiting the call to surrender if necessary, but he did not go into the court. The Rev. Stewart Headlam,

one of his sureties, sat at the solicitors' table during the afternoon, and Lord Douglas of Hawick was also present part of the day.

Summarised, the verdict in Taylor's case was as follows:—

On two counts alleging indecency with Charles and William Parker: *Guilty*.

On the count alleging the procuring of Wood for Wilde: *Not Guilty*.

On the count referring to Taylor procuring Charles Parker for Wilde: the jury disagreed, and they did not find that Wilde and Charles Parker committed the acts alleged.

xviii.—THE MARQUIS OF QUEENSBERRY AND LORD DOUGLAS OF HAWICK

On Wednesday, May 22nd (the day on which the last trial of Oscar Wilde was beginning at the Old Bailey) John Sholto Douglas, eighth Marquis of Queensberry, aged 51, and Percy Sholto Douglas, Lord Douglas of Hawick and Tibbers, his eldest surviving son, aged 26, were charged at the Marlborough Street Police Court with disorderly conduct in Piccadilly on the preceding day. The presiding magistrate was Mr. Hannay. Mr. S. D. Stoneham appeared for Lord Douglas of Hawick, the Marquis of Queensberry being undefended.

The magistrate having taken his seat, and the defendants being placed in the dock, the first witness was called. This was P.-C. Morrell, C.R.32, who, being sworn, said that he was on duty the previous afternoon at the corner of Bond Street when his attention was called to a large crowd across the street outside Scotts, the hatter's. He went there and found the Marquis and his son fighting. He separated them, after which they again closed, and witness parted them again. They met again outside Stewart's confectionery shop, and there began to fight again. Witness thereupon arrested the Marquis of Queensberry, while Lord Douglas of Hawick was taken in charge by another constable. At Vine Street Police

Station, the Marquis, in reply to the charge, said, "It's quite correct."

The Marquis of Queensberry, who defended himself, asked only one question of the constable. It was to suggest that Lord Douglas of Hawick began the attack and continued it while the Marquis was walking to his hotel. The constable, however, denied that this was so.

Mr. Stoneham (for Lord Douglas of Hawick):—At the station did you hear the Marquis say anything?

Witness:—I heard the Marquis say that he was willing to fight his son for £10,000.

You did not hear the Marquis call his son an opprobrious name?—No.

P.-C. Loughlin, C.R.6, who took Lord Douglas of Hawick into custody, was then called. He said he thought it was Lord Douglas of Hawick who struck the first blow. On the way to the police station the latter said to witness: "The Marquis has been writing to my wife letters of an obscene nature. I have written to my father on several occasions asking him to cease writing them. But he has refused to do so, and this is the only remedy I have. That is the cause of the row."

Mr. Stoneham:—Did not Lord Douglas say that he had spoken to his father and asked him to discontinue those letters, and that they were the cause of the row?

Witness:—Yes; similar words to those.

The next witness was Inspector Tett, who received the defendants at Vine Street Police Station. He

stated that after the charge had been read over to him, the Marquis exclaimed, "That is my son who has bailed Oscar Wilde to-day. He has been following me about, and struck me in Piccadilly." Lord Douglas added, "Yes, that occurred through my father writing letters of a most disgusting character to my wife."

This concluded the case for the police, and the Marquis of Queensberry proceeded to make his statement. He said that he had driven from the Old Bailey to the bottom of St. James's Street, and as he was crossing the road to go up Albemarle Street he saw his son walking down Piccadilly. As soon as the latter recognised his father, Lord Douglas of Hawick, according to the Marquis, "came straight at me, almost at a run, and pushed me up against a shop window, at the same time speaking at the top of his voice. I struck him certainly, but it was done in self-defence."

Mr. Stoneham, in giving Lord Douglas of Hawick's version of the affair, said that his client and a friend were walking in Piccadilly and saw Lord Queensberry crossing the street. The Marquis had evidently just come out of a post office, where he had sent the following telegram to Lady Douglas of Hawick :—

To LADY DOUGLAS.—Must congratulate on verdict. Cannot on Percy's appearance. Looked like a dug up corpse. Fear too much madness of kissing. Taylor guilty. Wilde's turn to-morrow.—QUEENSBERRY.

"That," said Mr. Stoneham, "is a sample of the

letters that Lord Queensberry has been writing not only to Lord Douglas's wife, but also to other members of the family. He has been requested time after time to stop those letters, but he still persists in continuing the annoyance. Your worship will remember the application I made some time ago to get Lord Queensberry bound over to keep the peace."*

Mr. Stoneham added that Lord Douglas of Hawick, seeing his father in the street on the previous evening, went up to him and asked him if he intended to cease writing those filthy letters. Lord Douglas was repeating the question when his father hit him with his fist in the eye. All that his client intended to do was to obtain an assurance from his father that such behaviour should cease. Lord Queensberry then remarked that as his son refused to receive any letters from him he was obliged to write to Lady Douglas.

Mr. Hannay, the magistrate, thought that these family affairs had nothing to do with the case. He suggested that the Marquis should call his witnesses.

Mr. Charles T. Sheriff was then called, and said that he was an eye-witness of the whole affair, and that Lord Douglas began the attack.

Mr. Charles Tyler swore that he saw Lord Douglas begin the fight by knocking Lord Queensberry against some trestles which a painter had left outside a shop.

Mr. Frederick Wisden said that he was in the company of Lord Douglas of Hawick at the time. Lord Douglas approached his father in a most respect-

* This application Mr. Hannay refused to entertain, giving as his reason that he declined to have any more dirty linen washed in his court.

ful fashion, and merely asked him to stop writing obscene letters to his wife. The Marquis replied by making a noise with his lips.

Mr. Stoneham :—Who struck the first blow?

Witness :—It was a near thing, but I think the Marquis was the quicker.

Mr. Stoneham :—He naturally would be, seeing that the Marquis is a boxer.

Lord Queensberry, with the magistrate's permission, then offered an explanation of the letters which he had written to his son's wife. He objected to the adjective "obscene" which had been applied to them. Hearing, he said, that Mr. Oscar Wilde was staying at Lord Douglas of Hawick's house, he (the Marquis) went down to see if his other son (Lord Alfred Douglas) was also there. He saw Lady Douglas, who gave him her word of honour that Lord Alfred was not staying there, and then he was obliged to tell her what he had called for.

Mr. Hannay again interposed, and the Marquis's further explanation was abandoned.

The magistrate, in giving his decision, said it seemed to him to be a matter of very little importance who began the fight, because both were fighting, both were close to policemen, and neither invoked their assistance. Under those circumstances he should bind over both defendants in their own sureties of £500 to keep the peace for six months.

xix.—THE FINAL TRIAL OF OSCAR WILDE

It does not often happen to any one to make three appearances at the Old Bailey at three consecutive Sessions before three different judges. Indeed, it was probably left for Mr. Oscar Wilde to be the first to achieve this extraordinary distinction, and it was therefore quite in accordance with his boast of not posing as ordinary. It will be remembered that the first occasion was when he appeared before Mr. Justice Henn Collins on April 3rd, 4th, and 5th to prosecute Lord Queensberry on a charge of criminal libel, which action resulted in a verdict of Not Guilty being returned against the Marquis, and was followed by the subsequent arrest of Mr. Wilde at the instigation of the Public Prosecutor.

Mr. Wilde was then tried at the Sessions of the Central Criminal Court, together with Alfred Taylor, before Mr. Justice Charles, on April 26th, 27th, 29th, and 30th, and May 1st. On the last day no verdict was returned on the main charges, the jury being unable to agree. Wilde was therefore taken back to Holloway, but was released on bail a few days later.

On Wednesday morning, May 22nd, 1895, he surrendered to his bail for re-trial before Mr. Justice Wills and a new jury.

Since Wilde's arrest and first trial the charges against him had been considerably modified, the pro-

secution realising how futile was the expectation of securing a conviction on many of the original counts. On the other hand, the fact that Alfred Taylor, who had been charged as his accomplice, was on the previous day found guilty on two of the counts in the indictment against him, was bound to prove prejudicial to Wilde's interests, especially when there was taken into consideration the bitterness of feeling stirred up by the newspapers against him. Sir Edward Clarke, after gaining his point that the two defendants should be tried separately, was unable to persuade the prosecution to take Wilde's case first. It is probable that had Sir Edward Clarke's wish been carried out, and the course of procedure which he advocated been followed, the prosecution would have found it very difficult, if not impossible, to win their case and obtain Wilde's conviction on the evidence of such witnesses as were brought against him.

It was, however, in Wilde's favour that the counts alleging conspiracy with Taylor to procure the commission of immoral acts had been withdrawn at the previous trial; and that the jury on the previous day had been unable to agree on the count charging Taylor with procuring for Wilde.

Mr. Wilde reached the court early, in company with his sureties, and took a seat at first on the usher's bench below the jury-box, opposite his leading Counsel, Sir Edward Clarke. Wilde looked haggard and ill, and his hair which generally had a slight natural wave, and was usually parted neatly down the middle, was in some disorder.

The Judge, Mr. Justice Wills, having taken his

seat at half-past ten, Wilde was called upon to surrender, and took his place in the dock.

Counsel engaged for the prosecution were the Solicitor-General (Sir Frank Lockwood, Q.C., M.P.), with Mr. C. F. Gill and Mr. Horace Avory. Sir Edward Clarke, Q.C., M.P., appeared for the defence, together with Mr. Charles Mathews and Mr. Travers Humphreys.

The Clerk of Arraigns having instructed the usher to "swear the jury for a misdemeanour" read out the indictment. It alleged that the accused being a male person did unlawfully commit certain acts of gross indecency with other male persons, to wit, Charles Parker, Alfred Wood, Edward Shelley, and two other persons unknown on divers dates. "To this indictment the prisoner pleads not guilty," added the clerk.

OPENING OF THE CASE

Sir Frank Lockwood, Q.C., before stating the case for the prosecution, said that he was bound to assume, as it was an entirely fresh jury, that they were totally ignorant of all the facts previously elucidated, and so it would be necessary to go through the case again in detail. As to the defendant personally, Counsel would content himself by saying that he was a man of literary attainments and the author of various dramatic works of power and interest.

The Solicitor-General then began his opening of the case to the jury. He said that the defendant was charged with offences against section xi. of the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885 on certain

days between February 20th, 1892, and October 22nd, 1893. The learned Counsel proposed to deal with these cases in the order in which they were alleged to have occurred.

By thus taking the cases in chronological order, Sir Frank Lockwood dealt first with the case of Edward Shelley, who was the only witness produced by the Crown who had not been already more or less discredited by admissions of complicity in blackmailing. The evidence of Shelley was, without doubt, the most damaging to Wilde, but before the conclusion of the trial all the charges in connection with this witness were withdrawn and a verdict of Not Guilty returned. Therefore the only cases left to the consideration of the jury were those dealing with self-confessed criminals who undoubtedly made gain by their appearance in court.

The Solicitor-General recalled the circumstances under which Wilde first met Edward Shelley, who was a lad of eighteen or nineteen, employed in the offices of Messrs. Elkin Mathews and John Lane, of the Bodley Head, Vigo Street, a firm which was acting at the time as Wilde's publishers. There was independent corroboration of this witness's story, declared Counsel, though it did not go to the length of describing the actual accomplishment of the offences. Acts like those alleged were not committed in the light of day, but as far as possible with the strictest secrecy and concealment.

In January, 1893, Wilde made the acquaintance of Alfred Wood, a young clerk out of employment, who was at that time living at 13, Little College Street,

Westminster, "a house occupied by a man of the name of Taylor," added the Solicitor-General, with an assumption that the jury had never heard of Taylor before. Counsel described what he called "the curious introduction" of Wood to Wilde. Wood was summoned by a telegram from Lord Alfred Douglas to the Café Royal, and was there accosted by Wilde, taken to dinner at the Florence in Rupert Street, and afterwards to Wilde's own house in Tite Street, where offences charged in the indictment were alleged to have taken place. A few weeks later Wilde provided Wood with funds to go to America. On the day after giving him this money Wilde was still apparently on good terms with Wood, as he entertained him to lunch in a luxurious manner. That was in March, 1893. A meeting between Wilde and Wood was arranged in Taylor's rooms in Little College Street. Wilde then gave £30 to Wood for giving up certain letters which had come into his possession. It was not difficult to see what that transaction meant. Yet on the next day, after entertaining Wood to lunch, Wilde gave him an additional £5. Wood then went to America.

The alleged offences with persons unknown were committed at the Savoy Hotel in March, 1893, when Wilde and Lord Alfred Douglas occupied the bed-rooms No. 361 and No. 362, which adjoined. Of the occurrences there there was the valuable corroborative evidence of the hotel servants, namely, of Jane Margaret Cotter, a chambermaid at the Savoy Hotel, and of a masseur named Migge.

The last section of the case was that in which Wilde

was charged with misconduct at the Savoy Hotel, and at rooms which he occupied at 10, St. James's Place, with Charles Parker, who had been introduced to him "by the man named Taylor." It would be shown that Charles Parker and his brother, William, were introduced to Wilde by Taylor in March, 1893, at a dinner given by the prisoner at Kettner's restaurant. After a most sumptuous dinner, Wilde took Charles Parker to the Savoy Hotel, and the visit was repeated a week later, the prisoner giving the youth money on both occasions. Parker's story was corroborated in the most convincing manner. Wilde met Parker from time to time, and gave him presents, including a cigarette case and a gold chain ring. At the end of 1893 Wilde appeared to have taken rooms in St. James's Place, where Parker paid frequent visits. Wilde took him also to various places of amusement, and visited him on one occasion at his apartments in Park Walk, Chelsea. The last occasion of their meeting was in the street. Wilde got out of a cab, shook hands with Charles Parker, and said he was looking as pretty as ever. Charles Parker's evidence was further corroborated by that of his brother, William; and further corroboration would be given by a waiter at the Savoy Hotel; by a lodger at the house in Park Walk; and by a waiter at St. James's Place, and by other witnesses. The Solicitor-General would like to have some explanation of the prisoner's relationship with the ex-valet and the ex-groom who were living in a poor lodging in Hunter Street, Brunswick Square.

"Gentlemen," concluded the Solicitor-General, "I

have endeavoured to limit myself to a plain and simple statement of the class of testimony which the prosecution is in a position to call before you. In conclusion, I can only invite your very earnest and careful attention to the evidence, for it is upon this evidence that the defendant must be judged and not upon any statement made by Counsel."

EDWARD SHELLEY'S EVIDENCE

Edward Shelley was then called and examined by Mr. Gill. Being sworn, he deposed that he was only seventeen when he first went to the Bodley Head, and that accounted for the modest amount of his pay, which was only fifteen shillings a week. He said that he first dined with Mr. Wilde at the Albemarle Hotel in a public room. He was afterwards asked to stay all night, and shared Mr. Wilde's bed. That was early in 1892. He had received a letter from Mr. Wilde inviting him to "come and smoke a cigarette" with him. A further visit was paid to the hotel after they had been to the Independent Theatre. On a subsequent occasion he again stayed late at the hotel. He visited various places of entertainment in company with the prisoner. He declined an invitation to Paris. He was spoken to by his employers about his intimacy with Mr. Wilde, and finally left their employment. In the spring of 1893 he wrote a letter to Mr. Wilde saying he would not see him again. After he left the office of the publishers he was for four months out of work, but then obtained a situation

in the City. He was now living with his parents. Witness then repeated evidence he had given at the previous trial. One fresh piece of information he gave was that Wilde had presented him with a copy of "Dorian Gray," on the flyleaf of which the author had written: "To Edward Shelley, poet and friend, from Oscar Wilde, poet and friend."

Cross-examined by Sir Edward Clarke, the witness said that his close intimacy with Mr. Wilde lasted only three months, and terminated nine or ten months before he left the employment of Mathews and Lane. In March, 1893, he went to see Mr. Wilde at the Savoy Hotel, where they quarrelled, and after that visit he wrote to Mr. Wilde saying that he would not see him again. Mr. Wilde replied to the effect that had the witness written that letter some months earlier it would have stung him, but coming as it did when he was flushed with the first success of "A Woman of No Importance," he did not feel it so much.

This must have been in April or May, 1893, and Sir Edward Clarke reminded the witness that at the police court he had said it was "at the end of 1893 or early in 1894" that he quarrelled with Mr. Wilde. Witness could not remember whether he did not also say that impropriety took place only on one occasion. He now thought there were two. On the first occasion he was not quite sober. He was excited, but not drunk. If he had realised what was going to happen he would have resented it.

Sir Edward Clarke:—Then why did you go again?

Witness:—I was weak, of course.

Within what space of time did these two incidents take place?—Within a week.

Did you think Mr. Wilde had also had too much to drink?—No, I did not.

Then it did not seem to you an accidental occurrence?—No, I was entrapped. He knew I admired him very much, and he took advantage of me, of my admiration, and of—I won't say my innocence—I don't know what to call it.

Has Mr. Wilde ever given you money?—Yes, long afterwards.

Not as the price of consenting to this?—No.

Witness said he had read a good deal of the lighter forms of literature, dramatic and poetic, and had “written a few things.” Mr. Wilde used to ask him to let him see them, but the witness thought they were too poor to show him.

Have you ever published any works of your own?—I have written some, but have not published anything.

Despite what you allege to have happened, did your friendship for Mr. Wilde continue up to the spring of 1893?—Yes.

Did you make any other mistake in the evidence you gave at the police court?—I hope not.

Sir Edward Clarke then read the two following letters which Shelley had written to Wilde:—

Sunday evening, Feb. 21st, 1892.

DEAR MR. OSCAR WILDE,

I must again thank you for the “House of Pomegranates” and the theatre ticket. It was very good of you to send them to me and I shall never forget your

kindness. What a triumph was yours last night! The play is the best I have seen on the stage, with such beauty of form and wit that it adds a new phase of pleasure to existence. Could Lady Blessington live anew the conversations would make her jealous. George Meredith might have signed it. How miserably poor everything else seems beside it! Except, of course, your books—but then your books are part of yourself.

The “triumph” of the previous night referred to the first production of “Lady Windermere’s Fan,” at the St. James’s Theatre, on February 20th, 1892.

The second letter from Shelley to Wilde was dated October 27th, 1892. It was as follows:—

MY DEAR OSCAR,

Will you be at home on Sunday evening next? I am most anxious to see you. I would have called this evening but I am suffering from nervousness, the result of insomnia, and am obliged to remain at home. I have longed to see you all through the week. I have much to tell you. Do not think me forgetful in not coming before, because I shall never forget your kindness and am conscious that I can never sufficiently express my thankfulness to you.

Sir Edward Clarke:—Now, Mr. Shelley, do you mean to tell the jury that, having in your mind that this man had behaved disgracefully towards you, you wrote this letter?

Witness:—Yes, because after these two occurrences he treated me very well. He seemed really sorry for what he had done. He introduced me to his wife. I dined with them twice, and he seemed to take a real interest in me.

The witness also stated that Mr. Wilde had offered

him £100 to enable him to go away and study, but that he refused it. Mr. Lane, his employer, had also offered to help him, but Shelley refused this assistance also, and in hysterical letters to Wilde wrote about "the brutal insults of Vigo Street." Shelley also mentioned in a letter his "horrible harsh existence"; and after leaving the Bodley Head and taking a clerkship in the City, he wrote of giving this up "and going down to live in Chelsea and read with a coach in the evening."

His parents had accused him of idleness, and that was why he wrote of "eating the bitter food of charity and contempt." He left his City employment shortly before the Queensberry case came on, and he had no employment now. The only money Wilde gave him in 1894 was ten shillings at Kettner's Restaurant.

In another letter, dated April 25, 1894, Shelley wrote:—

Oscar, I want to go away and rest somewhere—I think in Cornwall—for two weeks. I am determined to live a truly Christian life and I accept poverty as part of my religion. But I must have health. I have so much to do for my mother.

Sir Edward Clarke, having read this letter out, said to the witness:—What have you to do for your mother?

Witness:—I pay for my keep.

Counsel:—That is more like doing something for yourself. Have you a brother who is permanently unwell?—Yes.

Is his mind disordered?—Yes.

The letter went on:—

I am an artist. I know that I am. Will you see if you can lend me £10 till Christmas? I can repay it by that time. I must have rest. I am weak and ill. I am so thin, they think me strange.

Wilde did not send the £10, so the witness wrote another appeal, asking for assistance in finding a place in a publisher's or newspaper office. He added: "I would accept nothing from that viper John Lane. He hurt me too much. I despise him, but I cannot forget."

Sir Edward Clarke:—Why a viper, Mr. Shelley?

Witness:—I ought not to have used the word. I was angry with him.

Angry about what?—Mr. Lane had tried to make me break off my acquaintance with Mr. Wilde.

That is, Mr. Lane had offered to find you money to enable you to change your place of employment in order to get out of the way of Mr. Wilde?—Yes.

You ought to have been glad and grateful to Mr. Lane, for you knew then what kind of man Mr. Wilde was?—Yes, but—

Why weren't you?—It was human nature, I suppose—a failing.

Your human nature?—A failing of human nature.

In another letter Shelley wrote to Wilde: "You have deadly enemies in London. Hence the 'Daily News' article."*

Sir Edward Clarke:—Was your mental health getting worse and worse?—I made myself ill with studying.

* "Mr. Oscar Wilde and Edgar Poe," a review of *The Sphinx*, in the *Daily News*, June 11, 1894.

Were you worse than you are to-day?—There is nothing the matter with me now.

You are sure of that?—Quite sure.

Shortly after calling Mr. Lane “a viper,” Shelley wrote and asked him for employment. By the next post he wrote declaring that he would not take anything from Mr. Lane. In another letter he wrote to Wilde: “I am afraid sometimes I am not very sane. I feel so nervous and ill.”

In January, 1895, Shelley assaulted his father and was locked up. When he was arrested he sent for Mr. Wilde to bail him out. In further cross-examination by Sir Edward Clarke, the witness admitted that he was not in his right mind on that day. “I certainly could not have been sane to assault my father,” Shelley added.

Several other letters were subjected to an examination of this kind to show that Shelley was either untruthful or subject to hallucinations.

The cross-examination of the witness Shelley was then concluded.

Re-examined by the Solicitor-General:—At the time he was at Vigo Street, before he knew Mr. Wilde, he was a contented, happy boy. At the former trial he had given the same evidence as he gave that day.

EVIDENCE OF OTHER WITNESSES

Mr. Mathews, formerly partner in the firm of Elkin Mathews and John Lane, of the Bodley Head, Vigo Street, stated that he was aware of the intimacy

of Shelley with Mr. Oscar Wilde; and tried to put an end to it.

M. Vogel, proprietor of the Albemarle Hotel, deposed that his attention was attracted by the youthfulness of Mr. Wilde's visitors, and that in consequence he took steps to lose Wilde's patronage by pressing for payment of his bill.

The court then adjourned for luncheon.

On the resumption of the sitting after the luncheon interval the next witness was called.

Alfred Wood, who spoke in a very low voice, again described his acquaintance with Taylor and Wilde. He repeated the evidence he had given on previous occasions as to certain events which he alleged had occurred. He spoke of the visits to the houses of Wilde and Taylor, and of visits to other places. He described the presents the prisoner made to him. He went to America at the end of March, 1893. It was Lord Alfred Douglas who made the appointment for his first meeting with Mr. Wilde.

Cross-examined, Wood said that he was a clerk out of employment. He had earned a little by working for his brother, a turf commission agent, in Upper Islington.

Further questions as to his means of livelihood elicited the admission that when he occupied rooms at 72, Regent Street, Chelsea, Charles Parker had behaved indecently with a gentleman in Wood's room; and that Wood, a man named Allen, and

Charles Parker obtained money from the gentleman, Wood's own share in the spoils of that piece of blackmailing being no less than £175 out of a sum of £400 or £500. Witness admitted he had done nothing to deserve the money he had received.

Why were you given £175?—I suppose it was blackmailing, but I did not know it then.

Where was the money paid?—Near the station at Charing Cross.

Did you give Parker any of the money?—Allen did.

How much?—£30.

Witness could not remember how long ago it was that he left his employment as a clerk in the City. He could not say whether it was not in 1890.

Since you left that employment, have you ever earned any money honestly?—Yes, when I worked for my brother. He had also received about £100 under his deceased father's will. It was paid to him by a solicitor. He did not know the name of the solicitor. Pressed, he said it was a Mr. Tidy, of Sackville Street, the exact amount of the legacy being £88 2s. 10d.

How long had you known Allen?—From March or April, 1893.

On what date did you go to America?—I arrived on the first of April, 1893.

Did you say at the police court that when you went to Mr. Wilde's house on a certain occasion you were drunk?—I was not drunk, but I had had too much to drink. I knew what I was doing.

Was there anybody else besides you and Allen and

Charles Parker in the distribution of the money you obtained from a gentleman?—No, no one else.

Have you had other transactions of the same kind?—No.

How long had you been back from America?—I came back in May.

Where are you living now?—At Bromley Terrace, Greenwich.

Are you lodging there?—I am living with a detective.

A Crown detective?—Yes.

Wood said that the way he got hold of the letters Mr. Wilde had written to Lord Alfred Douglas was through his going to Oxford for a while to stay with Lord Alfred. While they were there, Lord Alfred Douglas had given him a suit of clothes, in one of the pockets of which were the letters. William Allen stole the letters from Wood, but afterwards returned them, keeping one back. "This one's quite hot enough," Allen said to Wood. Witness on his oath swore that he did not know what Allen meant by the words "hot enough."

Did you tell Mr. Wilde that Allen said that letter was "hot enough" for him?—No.

Did you ever read the letter yourself?—I don't think I did.

Why did you not return the letter to Lord Alfred Douglas?—I didn't know his address.

[The letter in question was the one Wilde himself produced in court at the trial of Lord Queensberry.]

How long had you been carrying about these letters?—About a month.

How many had you got in the first instance?—
There may have been two or three.

During the month had those letters been out of your possession?—Yes; they were taken out of my pocket by Allen.

Witness went on to say that when he asked Mr. Wilde for money, he (Wood) told him that he was “tired of life,” “tired of the big dinners,” and “tired of mixing with Wilde and Douglas and those people.”

Did you tell Mr. Wilde that you wanted to get away from some bad companions?—Yes.

Did you mention Allen as a person you wanted to get away from?—I did.

On being re-examined by the Solicitor-General, the witness stated that he first met Lord Alfred Douglas at Taylor’s rooms at 13, Little College Street. He had seen Lord Alfred Douglas and Mr. Oscar Wilde together in the same room at the Savoy Hotel.

CHARLES PARKER’S EVIDENCE

The witness Charles Parker was then called, and being sworn, and examined by Mr. Gill, proceeded to repeat the evidence he had given at the previous trial. He adhered to his story that Wilde had committed improprieties with him at the Savoy Hotel and elsewhere. Witness had formerly been a valet; now he was a gunner in the Royal Artillery.

Sir Edward Clarke then began his cross-examination.

Counsel:—Are you the Charles Parker who got £30 as blackmail from a gentleman who committed an indecent practice with you?

Witness:—Yes.

Where did those practices take place?—At my place, 7, Camera Square, Chelsea.

It will be remembered that the witness Wood had sworn that this particular incident had occurred at his rooms at 72, Regent Street, Chelsea, so the two witnesses clearly contradicted each other. Apart from that fact, it would have been thought that the unblushing avowal of these two witnesses that they had been guilty of immoral acts and had received money for the same, must have vitiated any evidence of theirs.

In further cross-examination by Sir Edward Clarke, Parker said that since the last trial he had been maintained at the expense of the prosecution. He was living at Chiswick with his brother, and both were under the care of a detective employed by the Crown. Witness had not done any military duty since March.

The further hearing of the case was then adjourned till the following morning, Wilde being released on bail as before.

Mr. Justice Wills advised the jury not to let anyone speak to them about the case.

xx.—THE SECOND DAY OF THE LAST TRIAL

The trial was continued on Thursday morning, May 23rd. It was Ascension Day, and the bells of St. Paul's could be heard distinctly from the Old Bailey. The court was somewhat less crowded than usual. During the early part of the day some of the Counsel engaged were not present, Mr. Horace Avory, on the side of the prosecution, and Mr. Charles Mathews, on the part of the defence, not arriving until after noon.

All the accomplices in the acts alleged against Wilde had been examined on the previous day, and it now only remained for the prosecution to make the most of their corroboration, and to call such evidence as they had of the events alleged to have occurred at the Savoy Hotel with the "persons unknown." After the very damaging cross-examination of at least two of the principal witnesses on the first day, it was felt that the Solicitor-General would put into the scale every scrap of corroborative evidence that he could get hold of.

There was a report that Wilde had been seized with illness in the dock on Wednesday, but there was no truth in it, although he was obviously much enfeebled and upset by the experiences he had been through. In the dock he sat with his head resting on his arms, a position which bespoke unutterable weariness.

WITNESSES CALLED TO CORROBORATE

William Parker was called. He said he was the elder brother of the witness Charles Parker, whose evidence had already been heard. Taylor invited witness and his brother to dine with Mr. Wilde at Kettner's on the occasion which has been referred to many times as Taylor's birthday. The dinner was a particularly good one. After dinner Mr. Wilde took Charles Parker to the Savoy Hotel. Taylor and witness returned to Little College Street. Shortly afterwards witness went into the country.

Cross-examined by Sir Edward Clarke:—

Did you know your brother was going there for an indecent purpose?

Witness:—That is what Taylor gave us to understand.

Did you hear such a proposal made to your brother and not interfere to prevent it?—No; I didn't then.

Had you intended to do the same sort of thing yourself?—Yes, perhaps.

You were perfectly sober?—Yes.

The Solicitor-General rose to re-examine the witness and asked him, "What had Taylor said to you?" but Sir Edward Clarke objected that the question was irregular.

His lordship sustained the objection, saying that the question went a little too far, and Sir Frank Lockwood resumed his seat.

EVIDENCE OF SAVOY HOTEL SERVANTS

Charles Robinson, of the Savoy Hotel, was called

by Mr. C. F. Gill to produce the records of Mr. Wilde's stay there in March, 1893, from the second to the twenty-ninth of the month.

Cross-examined:—He was asked for a copy of the bill about a week before the police court proceedings.

Counsel then proceeded to examine some of the hotel servants as to what they had seen and heard in Mr. Wilde's rooms.

Jane Cotter, a chambermaid, deposed that at first Mr. Wilde occupied bedroom No. 362 and Lord Alfred Douglas the room adjoining, No. 361. She found it necessary to call the attention of the house-keeper to the condition of Mr. Wilde's bed. On the third morning of his stay, at about eleven o'clock, Mr. Wilde rang the bell for the housemaid. On answering the bell, the witness met Mr. Wilde in the doorway of No. 361, and he told her he wanted a fire in his own room, No. 362. There she saw a boy of eighteen or nineteen years of age with dark close-cropped hair and a sallow complexion. Some days later Lord Alfred Douglas left the hotel, and Mr. Wilde then removed into rooms in the front of the hotel.

Cross-examined by Sir Edward Clarke, the witness said that the condition of the room was much worse on the first two nights Mr. Wilde was there than subsequently.

Counsel:—Why do you wear eye-glasses?

Witness:—Because my sight is bad.

Do you use those when you are about your work?

—Oh, dear, no.

Why do you wear them to-day?—Because I

thought I might have to recognise somebody.

Then you did not wear them when you say you saw the boy in Mr. Wilde's room, and you had to put them on if you wanted to recognise anybody to-day?
—Yes.

Re-examined by Mr. Gill:—She was quite sure she saw everything she described.

Sir Edward seemed quite satisfied at having proved the unreliability of this witness, and the cross-examination being concluded, Miss Jane Cotter tripped out of the box.

Alice Saunders, another chambermaid at the Savoy Hotel, said that she had had her attention called by the previous witness to the state of Mr. Wilde's room. The witness described the condition in which she said she found it.

Cross-examined:—She was first asked last Friday to give evidence.

Antonio Migge, a masseur employed at the hotel, repeated the evidence given at the previous trial, that he too had seen a boy in Mr. Wilde's room.

Cross-examined by Sir Edward Clarke, the witness stated that he had no recollection as to whether the door of the room was locked or not. He visited the room at the usual time for performing the massage. He knocked at the door and went in. Mr. Wilde told him he did not want him that morning.

Sir Edward Clarke then proved that at the last trial this same witness on being asked "Was the door locked?" had replied, "No, the door was not locked."

Nor could the witness remember whether the boy he saw was fair or dark. Sir Edward had again

succeeded in shaking the credibility of a witness, and that, too, in a part of the case on which the prosecution very largely relied.

Emile Becker, a waiter from the Savoy Hotel, was called. He repeated the evidence which he had given for the first time on the previous Monday in the trial of Alfred Taylor, that while Mr. Wilde was staying at the hotel witness had seen young men in Mr. Wilde's rooms. Witness thought he had probably seen about five young men in all. He had taken champagne and whiskies and sodas to the bedroom, and had seen young men there. After Mr. Wilde had the sitting-room in the front of the hotel, witness had served a supper of cold fowl and champagne for Mr. Wilde and a dark young man.

Sir Edward Clarke cross-examined with a view of showing that the accuracy of this witness's recollection might be due to his having read reports of the first trial.

I suppose you read the accounts of the previous trial?—Oh, yes.

You saw it stated that Parker said he had had chicken and champagne?—I think I saw it on Monday.

His Lordship:—Had you not seen it before?—No.

Counsel:—It was matter of considerable interest to everybody at the Savoy Hotel?—Yes, it was.

Did you read in the papers that Charles Parker said “We had chicken and champagne for supper”?—I don't know. I don't remember seeing it in the paper.

How many rooms had you to look after?—Seven sitting-rooms.

" Plenty of suppers in such a busy place?—Not many upstairs.

Have you seen Charles Parker?—Yes, he was pointed out to me.

You did not recognise him?—No.

Re-examined:—He was seen last Friday at the hotel by an inspector from Scotland Yard.

Annie Perkins, the next witness, said that she lived at Southsea. In 1893 she was housekeeper at the Savoy Hotel. She remembered her attention being drawn by the maid-servants to the condition of Mr. Wilde's room at the time. She gave instructions accordingly.

Mrs. Margery Bancroft deposed that while Parker was living at Park Walk, Chelsea, she had seen Mr. Wilde come there in a cab one night and the two went away together. Taylor lived close by in Chapel Street, and was constantly in and out of Parker's lodgings.

Cross-examined by Sir Edward Clarke, the witness became less confident, and said she could not swear that Parker went away in the cab. She saw Mr. Wilde get into the cab, and she knew Parker did not return to the house. Asked how she knew, the witness replied that her dog would have barked. She knew Mr. Wilde well by sight; he had been pointed out to her as he was standing outside the Royal Academy with two ladies, but she had never seen him at Park Walk. She knew Charles Parker paid five shillings a week for his rooms, because she made out the landlady's bill.

Re-examined:—The cab in which Mr. Wilde drove away had three lights to it.

Mrs. Lucy Rumsby, landlady of the house at 50, Park Walk, Chelsea, where Parker lodged; and Mrs. Sophia Gray, landlady of the house in Chapel Street, Chelsea, where Taylor stayed, repeated the evidence which they had given on previous occasions. Mrs. Gray said that Charles Parker visited Taylor at Chapel Street and sometimes stayed. Mr. Wilde had visited Taylor on one occasion, she thought.

Cross-examined:—Mr. Wilde called after Taylor had met with an accident by having been run over by a cab.

Ex-Inspector Kearley, who had conducted the inquiries for Lord Queensberry, produced the papers which he had found in an old hat-box at Taylor's lodgings.

Thomas Price, a servant at 10, St. James's Place, deposed that during Mr. Wilde's tenancy of rooms in that house he slept there only about a dozen times. A play of Mr. Wilde's was running at the St. James's Theatre at that time. The witness had seen Taylor only once. Parker was at the rooms several times.

Inspectors Richards and Brockwell, of Scotland Yard, described again the arrest of Mr. Oscar Wilde on the afternoon of April 5th, at the Cadogan Hotel, Sloane Street.

Some formal evidence was given by shorthand writers and others who had taken the official shorthand notes of the evidence in the case of *Regina v. Queensberry*.

The Solicitor-General then put in these notes, and declared that he intended to read portions of them

which had reference to Wilde's relations with Taylor, Shelley, and others.

Sir Edward Clarke :—Then, my lord, I propose to read the examination in chief.

His lordship suggested as a compromise that the learned Counsel should each read such portions of the evidence given at the earlier trials as he desired.

This suggestion being adopted, Sir Edward Clarke proceeded to read Mr. Wilde's evidence in chief in the prosecution of Lord Queensberry for libel.

The Solicitor-General had promised that his reading should be confined to passages which related to Wood, Shelley, Parker, and Taylor.

However, Sir Frank Lockwood first read the cross-examination of Mr. Wilde by Mr. Carson concerning the former's correspondence with Lord Alfred Douglas. The Solicitor-General lightly passed over the passage in which Wilde had complained of the unfair way in which Mr. Carson read the letters so as to put the worst construction on the writer's words.

In the second of the stolen letters, the one containing the words "red and yellow wine," Wilde had written : "I would sooner be rented all day than have you bitter, unjust, and horrible." It was explained that the word "rent" was a slang term for "black-mail." Another passage on which Counsel laid emphasis was that in which Wilde wrote : "Why are you not here, my dear, my wonderful boy? I fear I must leave—no money, no credit, and a heart of lead."

Mr. Gill relieved the Solicitor-General some time before the court adjourned for lunch at half-past one. On resuming, Mr. Avory continued the reading.

Soon after three o'clock the last of the evidence of the Queensberry trial was finished, and that brought the case for the prosecution to a close.

Before going further, Sir Edward Clarke submitted that in regard to the counts alleging indecent practices at the Savoy Hotel there was no case to go to the jury. Parker had sworn that he left the hotel on both occasions soon after midnight; he could not therefore be identified with the boys whom the hotel servants declared they saw in the mornings.

His lordship said that the condition of the rooms furnished a certain amount of corroboration of the charges of misconduct. The very fact that a man in such a position in life was found with a boy in his bed seemed to his lordship to be so utterly unusual that very little additional evidence would make a case to go to the jury. On the other hand, it was sworn that whatever occurred then was reported to the house-keeper of the hotel, and it was a very strange thing that she should have done nothing. He did not know what sort of person she could have been to take no steps in the matter at once.

The Solicitor-General pleaded that it might have been that the hotel authorities were anxious to avoid a publication of a scandal that would be prejudicial to the establishment.

Sir Edward Clarke submitted that there was no evidence whatever that Wilde and the boy were in bed together.

The Judge assented, and said that the fact that Wilde was said to have rung for the chambermaid to come into the room made it difficult for him (Mr.

Justice Wills) completely to accept the story. The incident deposed to by the masseur, Migge, was even more slender from the point of view of evidence. It would not be fair to a man charged as Wilde was that a number of nothings should be put together to make up a something. He thought, however, that on the whole it would be wiser to leave the whole matter to the jury; yet he felt that the question was so completely on the line that he would reserve it for a higher court if Counsel desired.

The Solicitor-General said he would certainly ask that the whole of the charges should be left to the jury who could weigh for themselves the worth of the evidence.

Sir Edward Clarke pursued that with regard to Shelley there was no corroboration, and that witness's evidence ought to be withdrawn from the jury.

The Solicitor-General asked what were the relations of these two men of such unequal ages? He intended to invite the jury to say that Shelley was a young man fascinated by the literary culture of Wilde, and brought within his companionship and control and domination—that he was "entrapped," as Shelley put it, and that he was not so much an accomplice as a victim. There was, after all, a certain amount of corroboration—evidence of opportunity.

His lordship said he must confess that Shelley's letters left on his mind a notion of disturbed intellect. It would be a terrible thing for society at large if it were to be considered unnatural for a man to ask a younger man of good character to dine with him.

The Solicitor-General reminded his lordship of that

letter in which Shelley had written, "Let God judge the past," and of the fact that Shelley was not in the position of an accomplice.

His lordship said that with regard to Shelley he was very clearly of opinion that he must be regarded, on his own evidence, as an accomplice, and his evidence should be corroborated. It seemed to him that there was nothing of the kind there. Shelley's own letters to Wilde were rather against the supposition, and his lordship felt it his duty to withdraw that part of the case from the consideration of the jury.

Excitement in court was intense when the Judge intimated his intention of withdrawing from the jury the counts dealing with Shelley which had been universally regarded as the strongest against the accused. Wilde for the first time sat up erect, and was evidently satisfied that this part of the evidence against him was rejected. Counsel for the Crown were obviously taken by surprise and turned in their confusion to their law books. In the previous trial before Mr. Justice Charles, that learned judge had ruled that Shelley was "the only serious witness," the only one untainted with blackmail. Yet it was clear that Shelley's evidence was wholly uncorroborated. The Solicitor-General therefore offered correspondence as corroboration, which Mr. Justice Wills stated, obviously enough, was proof rather of innocence than of guilt.

Sir Edward Clarke at once passed to the case of Wood, and pointed out that there was no corroboration of any sort or kind of his own evidence that he had been at Tite Street.

The Solicitor-General submitted that there was ample corroboration, and protested against having these cases withdrawn from the jury. There was corroboration in the payment by Wilde of the money which enabled Wood to go to America. The Solicitor-General then quoted authorities to show that although his lordship had rightly stated the rule of practice, it was not a rule of law, and that it was the duty of a judge to tell the jury that they might, if they pleased, act on the unconfirmed testimony of an accomplice.

Sir Edward Clarke quoted authorities to the contrary. It was cruel, he said, to suggest that the generous action of a man in giving a lad the means of getting away from bad companions, to begin a new life in another country, was a corroboration of his own misconduct. He relied upon a rule of practice, as a wholesome rule of two hundred years' standing, even if it was not actually a rule of law.

At these words there was applause in various parts of the court.

The Judge said that this case was slightly different from the other. His lordship had no doubt as to the wholesome rule on which he had acted in the other case, and when it came to his turn to sum up he would explain why he did not withdraw Wood's case, and in what direction he found corroboration. It seemed to him, after hearing the cross-examination of Wilde in the Queensberry case, that the relations of the two men formed a question that the jury ought to consider.

The court then adjourned till the following morning. Wilde was again released on bail, and left the Old Bailey with his sureties.

xxi.—FOR THE DEFENCE

The trial was continued on Friday, May 24th. Considerable excitement prevailed in court when it became known that Mr. Oscar Wilde was to be placed in the witness-box to give evidence on his own behalf. Accompanied by his sureties, he arrived at the court shortly after ten o'clock, and for some minutes was engaged in close conversation with his junior Counsel, Mr. Travers Humphreys. Counsel for the Prosecution (the Solicitor-General and Mr. C. F. Gill) were at the same time in consultation over their briefs at the other end of the same bench. After conversing with his Counsel, Wilde talked with Lord Douglas of Hawick and Mr. Stewart Headlam (his sureties) till the Judge entered at half-past ten.

On being called upon to surrender, Wilde again took his place in the dock.

On the arrival of Sir Edward Clarke, proceedings began.

The Solicitor-General immediately rose in order to re-open the discussion of the previous evening as to the counts of the indictment which concerned Shelley being withdrawn from the jury. Counsel quoted a more recent case than those quoted previously, namely, the case of *Regina v. Meunier*, in which the judge had said that no doubt it was the practice to warn a jury that they should not convict unless they

thought the evidence of an accomplice was corroborated, but that he knew of no power to withdraw the case from the jury for want of corroborative evidence. That was the decision of Mr. Justice Cave as recently as June, 1894. Mr. Justice Collins had concurred. It was an extradition case. He (the Solicitor-General) did not presume to re-argue the point upon which his lordship had given his decision, but he thought it his duty to call attention to that recent judgment.*

Mr. Justice Wills said that he preferred to adhere to the course he had taken as the result of very serious deliberation, but he was willing to reserve the question for the consideration of the Court of Crown Cases Reserved.†

* Queen's Bench Division, June 11, 1894.
In re Meunier.

A prisoner committed for extradition, on two charges of committing anarchist outrages in France, by causing explosions at a café and at certain barracks, applied for a writ of habeas corpus. The two charges were included in one committal:

Held, that if the charges had depended on the uncorroborated evidence of an accomplice (which was not the case), that would not be a ground for discharging the prisoner, for absence of corroboration was not conclusive in favour of the prisoner's right to acquittal, but the magistrate had the discretion as to whether the evidence was sufficient to justify a committal, that separate committals were not necessary, that the outrage at a barracks was not an offence of a political character, within the meaning of s. 3, sub-s. 1, of the Extradition Act, 1870, for to constitute a political offence there must be two or more parties in the State, each seeking to impose the government of their own choice on the other, which was not the case with regard to anarchist crimes, and therefore the prisoner was liable to extradition. (*Law Reports*, 1894, vol. ii., page 415.)

† This decision of the learned Judge so much annoyed the Solicitor-General that, when outside the court during the luncheon interval later, he was heard to refer to his lordship as "an old fool."

OPENING OF THE DEFENCE

Sir Edward Clarke then rose to open the case for the defence. He said it became his duty to make some observations to the jury on what remained of the case which was deliberately launched against Mr. Wilde. He should not detain the jury long, and he did not think that it would be necessary to detain them long when he came to address them hereafter on the subject of the evidence 'on which the jury were called to rely, as the amended case was very limited. He should not discuss in detail now the evidence which had been given in the case, because that evidence was not complete.

The learned Counsel continued as follows:—

I shall call Mr. Wilde into the witness-box again to state on his oath for the third time in this court that there is no truth whatever in the accusations which are made against him, and to face for the third time in this court, and now with a new assailant, that cross-examination which may be administered to him in regard to these accusations. When he has given that evidence, and when he has been cross-examined, the case will be complete, and it will be my duty to address you upon the character of the 'evidence with which you are asked to deal.

Some time ago, he went on, when the case was first brought against the accused, the indictment contained twenty-five counts, some of which were counts for conspiracy, and in the indictment there was one point reserved which could be argued if necessary. The evidence for the Crown was heard, and then

suddenly all the counts for conspiracy were withdrawn, and on the other counts the jury were discharged because they could not agree upon a verdict. Then came this trial. He could not imagine any reason of logic or fairness which could be suggested for the course which was adopted of trying the other defendant first. In Taylor's case the jury were unable to agree as to the issue referring to Mr. Wilde, and were discharged without giving a verdict as to that issue. Practically this was the third time this issue had been placed before a jury. There could be no cause for complaint against him (Sir Edward Clarke) if he felt a little soreness at the treatment Mr. Wilde had received.

He could not leave one observation unmade, that in the evidence given by Mr. Wilde at the hearing of the charge of libel against the Marquis of Queensberry, there was only one statement which was contradicted by an independent witness: that Mr. Wilde had never been to Park Walk, and a woman had been called on the part of the prosecution who stated that she had seen a gentleman who, she said, was Mr. Wilde, and she was the only independent witness to contradict any statement made by Mr. Wilde. He asked the jury to remember that in relation to the question with which they had to deal. What he had to say as to the character of the witnesses on whose evidence they were asked to rely he would make hereafter. It was not enough to discredit the evidence of the accused: the Crown must persuade the jury to believe the evidence of their witnesses if their case was to be established. The action of

Mr. Wilde had not been in the least inconsistent with that of a man who, conscious of innocence, was prepared to face the charges of the blackmailers. A guilty man could not have undergone the terrible ordeal of examination and cross-examination on three different occasions.

Sir Edward then traced the history of the case from the action of the Marquis of Queensberry in leaving a libellous card at the defendant's club. He dwelt on the continued friendship of the defendant with the Marchioness of Queensberry and her sons. Mr. Wilde had heroically fought against the accusations made against him, accusations that had broken down piece by piece.

Referring to the attitude adopted by the Solicitor-General in the case, Sir Edward Clarke said :—

I had the honour to hold the office of Solicitor-General, which Sir Frank Lockwood now holds, for a longer period than any man has held it during the last hundred years, and having been Solicitor-General for six years* it is not likely that I, at any place or time, will speak lightly of the responsibilities of that office. But I always look upon the responsibility of a Crown Counsel, and especially upon the responsibility of a law officer of the Crown, as a public rather than a private interest or responsibility. He is a minister of justice, with a responsibility more like the responsibility of a judge than like that of a counsel retained for a particular combatant in the forensic fray. I learned my work in this court from the best example I ever saw of a law officer conducting criminal cases,

* 1886—1892.

that great advocate and great gentleman, Sir John Holker,* who twenty years ago was conducting great causes in this court with a determined fairness which I admired; and I declared at the time that I trusted I might be able some day to emulate it. While, therefore, I say these things without the least unfriendliness of feeling towards the Solicitor-General, I say them in the hope that I may do something to induce my learned friend to remember—what I fear for a moment yesterday he forgot—that he is not here to try to get a verdict of guilty by any means he may have, but that he is here to lay before the jury for their judgment the facts on which they will be asked to come to a very serious consideration. I have now to answer but the remnant of a charge. But as the case has been whittled down, so the efforts of the prosecution have been redoubled; and instead of facing Mr. Gill—of the tone of whose conduct of the last case I had never for a moment to complain—down comes a law officer of the Crown armed with the strange and invidious privilege (which I myself when Solicitor-General never once exercised, and will not exercise if ever I fill that distinguished position again) of over-riding the usual practice of the court. Whether the defendant calls witnesses or not, the Solicitor-General enjoys the right—though why he should enjoy it I cannot imagine—of the last word with the jury. But for this I might have relied upon the reading of the defendant's evidence at the last trial. Reckoning with this, the defendant, broken as he is now, as anyone

* Sir John Holker, Solicitor-General, 1872; afterwards a Lord of Appeal; died 1882.

who saw him at the first trial must see he is, by being kept in prison without bail—contrary to practice, and as I believe contrary to law—will submit himself again to the indignity and pain of going into the witness-box. Unfit as he is after the ordeal he has gone through, he will repeat on oath his denial of the charges which have been made against him.

OSCAR WILDE IN THE WITNESS-BOX

Wilde was called at ten minutes past eleven. At Sir Edward Clarke's request the witness was allowed to be seated in the box. Only when Wilde began to speak was the full force of Sir Edward Clarke's remarks seen. Wilde's voice, at the first trial so full and confident, had become hollow and husky. He seemed glad to lean over the front of the witness-box for support.

Briefly and in very general terms he was examined once more as to his friendship with Lady Queensberry and her sons; as to Lord Queensberry's objections to his friendship with Lord Alfred Douglas; and as to the incident of the libellous card. The witness described the production of his various plays; and declared that it was for the convenience of his literary work, and to be near the theatre that he took the chambers at 10, St. James's Place. He added: "Most literary men like to work out of their own house. It is quieter and better." He was writing "An Ideal Husband" at the time.

Counsel:—You made certain remarks upon the

evidence of Charles Parker when you were in the box before?—Yes.

Have you any qualifications to make on those remarks?—No.

You have been living with your wife since you were married, in 1884, at 16, Tite Street?—Yes.

Sir Edward Clarke concluded his examination by asking:—

Is there any truth whatever in the accusations made against you in this indictment?

Wilde answered with emphasis and in a voice full of conviction:—

None whatever.

The Solicitor-General then rose to cross-examine the witness. Wilde immediately stood up, but Sir Frank Lockwood said, “Don’t rise, please, unless you wish,” to which the witness replied, “I can hear better.” In a few minutes, however, Wilde resumed his seat in the box.

The Solicitor-General:—When did your acquaintance with Lord Alfred Douglas begin?

Witness:—In 1892.

And when did the Marquis of Queensberry first object?—In March, 1893.

Are you sure?—I am very bad about dates. It must have been last year, 1894.

Where is Lord Alfred Douglas now?—Abroad.

Where?—In Paris.

When did he go?—About three weeks ago.

Did he leave after the first trial?—No, he stayed for a while after the Queensberry trial.

Did he stay till your first trial as defendant?—
No; he went away to France at my wish.

Of course you have been in communication with
him?—Yes.

What did you do when you learned that the
Marquis of Queensberry objected to your friendship
for his son?—I said I was perfectly ready to cease
the acquaintance if it would make peace between him
and his father; but he preferred to do otherwise.

And the intervention of his father had no effect?—
No.

The Solicitor-General then read the two letters
which have already been referred to, written by
Wilde to Lord Alfred Douglas.

Are these a sample of the style in which you
addressed Lord Alfred Douglas?—No; I do not think
I should say a sample. No; the letter written from
Torquay was intended to be a kind of prose poem in
answer to a poem Lord Alfred had written to me in
verse. It was written under circumstances of great
feeling.

Why did you choose the words, “My Own Boy,” as
a mode of address?—I adopted them because Lord
Alfred Douglas is so much younger than myself. The
letter was a fantastic, extravagant way of writing to a
young man. As I said at the first trial, it does not
seem to me to be a question of whether a thing is right
or proper, but of literary expression. It was like a
little sonnet of Shakespeare.

I did not use the word proper or right. Was it
decent?—Oh, decent? Of course; there is nothing
indecent in it.

Do you think that was a decent way for a man of your age to address a man of his?—It was a beautiful way for an artist to address a young man of culture and charm. Decency does not enter into it.

Doesn't it? Do you understand the meaning of the word, sir?—Yes.

The Solicitor-General (reading):—“ It is a marvel that those red rose-leaf lips of yours should have been made no less for music of song than for madness of kisses.”

And do you consider that decent?—It was an attempt to write a prose poem in beautiful phraseology.

Did you consider it decent phraseology?—Oh, yes, yes.

Then do you consider that a decent mode of addressing a young man?—I can only give you the same answer, that it is a literary mode of writing what is intended to be a prose poem.

“ Your slim gilt soul walks between passion and poetry. . . . Hyacinthus, whom Apollo loved so madly, was you in Greek days.” You were speaking of love between men?—What I meant by the phrase was that he was a poet, and Hyacinthus was a poet.

“ Always, with undying love”?—It was not a sensual love.

Is that again poetic imagery or an expression of your feelings?—That is an expression of my feelings. (The witness smiled and bowed to Sir Frank.)

The Solicitor-General then read the following letter. In his manner of reading he seemed deliberately to set himself to work to create a tainted

"atmosphere," one in which even the most innocent expressions of friendship, or of harmless humour could be construed into a bad meaning.

DEAREST OF ALL Boys,—Your letter was delightful, red and yellow wine to me; but I am sad and out of sorts. Bosie, you must not make scenes with me. . . . they wreck the loveliness of life. I cannot see you, so Greek and gracious, distorted with passion. I cannot listen to your curved lips saying hideous things to me. . . . Don't do it; you break my heart. I must see you soon. You are the divine thing I want, the thing of grace and beauty; but I don't know how to do it. Shall I come to Salisbury? There are many difficulties. My bill here is £49. . . .

Breaking off, the Solicitor-General asked:—That, I suppose, is true—that is not poetic?

Witness:—Oh, no, no; that was prose of the most sordid kind.

Continuing the letter:—

I have also got a new sitting-room over the Thames. Why are you not here, my dear, my wonderful boy?

Your own OSCAR.

The Solicitor-General:—He came and stayed with you at the Savoy?

Witness:—Yes, in the month of February.

Did he come to you in response to that appeal?—He came shortly afterwards on his way to Germany.

How often did he stay with you at the Savoy Hotel?—Three times.

You were alone, you two?—Oh, yes.

• The approach to your room was through his?—Yes, Were you aware of his father objecting to your intimacy?—Oh, no.

What was the charge which Lord Queensberry made against you?

The witness, after a little fencing with the prosecuting Counsel, quoted the words on the libellous card, "posing as a sodomite."

Between Lord Queensberry's committal and his trial, did you and Lord Alfred Douglas go abroad?—Yes.

Having obtained the committal of Lord Queensberry, you and Lord Alfred Douglas left the country together?—Yes. We were abroad about a week, and I returned to appear as prosecutor.

Before the trial did you see Lord Queensberry's plea of justification?—Yes.

That plea alleged all the misconduct of which evidence has since been given; besides making charges which have not been heard because they refer to occurrences in Paris?—Yes.

Did you abandon the prosecution?—It was abandoned by the advice of my Counsel.

With your consent?—Yes, I admit it was with my consent, but none of those matters had been entered into. It was entirely about literature, and it was represented to me that I could not get a verdict because of those two letters you have read.

Was Taylor present?—I did not see him during the trial, but he sent me a letter.

Were you not cross-examined as to your knowledge of Taylor and his character?—Yes.

And as to the establishment he maintained at 13, Little College Street?—Yes.

How long had you known Taylor?—I met him first in September, 1892.

Did you visit him?—Yes, I paid visits to his rooms, but I have not been there more than five or six times in my life.

Was there any but male society there?—Oh, no; entirely male.

Youths?—Oh, young men.

What were their names?—I met Mavor and Schwabe there. I only went there to tea parties lasting half an hour or so, and I cannot after a lapse of three years remember whom I met. You ask me to remember whom I met at a tea party three years ago. It is childish. How can I?

Did you meet Charles Mason there?—No, I met him at a dinner.

The boys Wood, Mavor, and Parker, what was their occupation?—One doesn't ask people such questions at a tea party.

Did Taylor strike you as being a pleasant companion?—Yes, I thought him very bright.

Did you know what his occupation was?—No; I understood that he had none.

Had any of these young men any occupation?—Oh, they were young men—singers—I did not ask.

Did you see anything remarkable in the furnishing of Taylor's rooms?—No, nothing.

The windows were curtained?—Yes, but not obscured.

Did you know that Taylor's male friends stayed with him and shared his bed?—No. I know it now.

Does that alter your opinion of Taylor?—No, I don't think so. I don't think it is necessary to conclude that there was anything criminal. It was

unusual. I don't believe anything criminal took place between Taylor and these boys; and if they were poor and he shared his bed with them it may have been charity.

Did it shock you that he should have done it?—No, I saw no necessity for being shocked.

I must press you. Do you approve of his conduct?—I don't think I am called upon to express approval or disapproval of any person's conduct.

Would the knowledge that they habitually shared his bed alter your opinion of Taylor?—No.

Sir Edward Clarke objected to the examination of the witness as to his opinion of other people.

His lordship upheld the contention, but pointed out that it came too late.

Wilde himself objected to the general character of the question whether he gave presents to the young men he met at Taylor's. He remembered giving a cigarette case to Mavor. It cost £4.

Did you give one to Charles Parker also?—Yes, but I am afraid it only cost £1.

Silver?—Well, yes. I have a great fancy for giving cigarette cases.

To young men?—Yes.

How many have you given?—I might have given seven or eight in 1892 and 1893.

His lordship interposed by saying that a cigarette case conveyed no impression to anyone's mind unless he knew what the Solicitor-General meant.

Sir Frank Lockwood then changed the subject.

The Solicitor-General:—Was the conversation of these young men literary?

Witness:—No; but the fact that I had written a play which was a success seemed to them very wonderful, and I was gratified at their admiration.

The admiration of these boys?—Yes. I am fond of praise. I like to be made much of.

By these boys?—Yes.

Whose very names you don't remember?—Yes. I admit that I am enormously fond of praise and admiration, and that I like to be made much of by my inferiors—inferiors socially. It pleases me very much.

What pleasure could you find in the society of boys much beneath you in social position?—I make no social distinctions.

What did you do with them?—I read to them. I read one of my plays to them.

Did it not strike you that in your position you could exercise a considerable influence over these lads for good or ill?—No, I am bound to say I don't think it did. The only influence I could exercise on anybody would be a literary influence. Of course in the case of these young men that would be out of the question. Otherwise I don't see what capacity I have for influencing people.

I did not mean literary influence.—I like to be liked. I liked their society simply because I like to be lionised.

You, a successful literary man, wished to obtain praise from these boys?—Praise from anyone is very delightful. Praise from literary people is usually tainted with criticism.

You had not known Taylor many months when you invited him to dine on the occasion of his

birthday, and gave him carte blanche to bring his friends?—That is so.

Did you limit the number?—Oh dear, no.

As many as he liked?—Well, I did not ask him to bring a crowd.

Then it was a pure coincidence that the table was laid for four, and that he brought the two Parkers?—No. I think he had ordered the dinner himself. I told him to go to Kettner's because I have been in the habit for years of dining there.

Did you know at the time that the Parkers were a valet and a groom respectively?—No, and had I known it I should not have cared.

You have no sense at all of social differences?—No.

You preferred Charles?—I make no preferences.

You like bright boys?—I like bright boys. Charles Parker was bright. I liked him.

Did you not pause to consider whether it would be of the slightest service to lads in their position to be entertained in such style by a man in your position?—No. They enjoyed it as schoolboys would enjoy a treat. It was something they did not get every day. I don't suppose they would have cared to be entertained to a chop and a pint of ale—they were used to that.

You looked on them as schoolboys?—They were amused by the little luxuries of Kettner's—the pink lamp-shades and so forth.

Did you give them wine?—Yes. I certainly should not stint a guest.

You would let them drink as much as they liked?

—I should not limit their consumption; but I should consider it extremely vulgar for anyone to take too much wine at table.

After the dinner what did you do?—I bade the Parkers good-bye and they went away with Taylor.

Did you not take Charles Parker to the Savoy Hotel?—No, certainly not.

Was Taylor charming?—Charming is not the word I would apply to him. I found him bright and pleasant.

Intellectual?—Not intellectual. Clever, decidedly.

Artistic?—Yes.

Very good taste with his scents and —?—I think it good taste to use perfumes. I thought his rooms were done up with considerable taste. I think he had a very pleasant taste. His rooms were cheerful.

Not a very cheerful street, Little College Street?—Few streets are cheerful. I have known artists who lived quite close there.

Did you like the situation?—I thought it a particularly nice one—close to Westminster Abbey.

Is it true that when you met Parker in Trafalgar Square you used the words, “ You are looking as pretty as ever”?—No, I don’t think I used the words.

Would you consider such words right to use to a youth?—Oh, no. It would be frivolous.

You don’t object to being frivolous?—Oh, I—

Sir Edward Clarke objected to the cross-examination going away to subjects which had nothing to do with the charges, but the Judge thought Sir Edward

Clarke was not justified in raising any objection.

Did you ever sup alone with any young man at the Savoy Hotel about that time?—I could not remember. You are asking me of three years ago. Lord Alfred Douglas may have been with me.

But he would be perfectly well known to the waiters at the Savoy?—Oh, yes.

Wherever you are well known, he would be?—Oh, I don't know that.

You have stayed together at the Savoy, at the Albemarle, at the Avondale, at St. James's Place, at the Metropole at Brighton, at Cromer, at Goring, at the Albion at Worthing, and at Torquay?—Yes. He has not stayed with me at St. James's Place, but I have lent him my rooms there.

Did Charles Parker ever visit you?—He might have visited me seven or eight times at St. James's Place, and on one occasion he dined with me at Kettner's, and we afterwards went to the Pavilion.

When did you last see him?—In December last, in the street.

Did you receive this letter from him?—

7, Camera Square.

DEAR OSCAR,

Am I to have the pleasure of dining with you this evening? If so, kindly reply by messenger or wire to the above address. I trust you can, and we can spend a pleasant evening. With kind regards and apologies,

Yours faithfully, CHAS. PARKER.

Witness:—Yes, I remember receiving that letter.

Did you respond to the invitation?—No, I don't think so.

Did you ever go to see Parker at his 'Chelsea lodgings'?—No. I am certain I didn't.

How much money have you given Charles Parker in cash?—Four or five pounds.

Why?—Oh, I give young men money with pleasure.

Do you remember a young man named Scarfe?—Yes. Taylor brought him to see me. Scarfe represented himself as a young man who had made money in Australia.

Why was he brought to you?—Because many people at that time had great pleasure and interest in seeing me.

Did he call you Oscar?—Yes.

At once?—I had to ask him to. I have a passion for being called by my Christian name. It pleases me.

Did you give him a cigarette case?—Yes.

Has he dined alone with you?—Yes.

Do you remember Alphonse Conway?—Yes. I met him on the beach at Worthing last year in August. He had an ambition to go to sea.

Of what station in life is he?—Of no particular station.

Did he not sell papers on the pier?—Oh, never while I was there.

What was his mother?—She was a widow, and let lodgings.

Did you buy him a suit?—Yes, of blue serge.

And a stick?—Yes.

And took him to Brighton?—Yes, we had a twenty-four hours' trip to Brighton. That was a month afterwards.

What rooms had you at Brighton?—Two bed-rooms and a sitting-room. We slept in adjoining rooms.

When did you see Conway last?—Outside the court two days ago.

The Solicitor-General then proceeded to cross-examine the witness on what he called the “moral effects” of taking a lad in Conway’s position for an outing. At this point the Marquis of Queensberry entered the court, and, being unable to get a seat, remained standing at the back, sucking the brim of his hat and staring at the witness.

The Solicitor-General continued his cross-examination, Wilde meanwhile taking frequent sips of water from a glass by his side.

Do you know Harrington?—Yes. I met him in the company of Schwabe at the Café Royal.

The Solicitor-General here produced two scarf-pins, but the witness denied that he had given them to anyone or had ever seen them before.

Did you meet Wood by appointment at the Café Royal?—Yes. I had been asked to assist him, and took him to supper at the Florence. I had already had supper myself.

Then why not give him five shillings to go and get his supper?—Ah, that would be treating him like a beggar. He was sent to me by Lord Alfred Douglas.

Did you know he came from 13, Little College Street?—No, I did not know that. He told me he was a clerk out of employment, and was anxious to find employment. I could not do that, but I gave him money.

Why should he be sent to you for money?—The money was not really from me, but was from Lord Alfred Douglas, who was at Salisbury.

There are such things as postal orders, I believe?—Yes.

Did you tell him your people were away from home at the time?—Yes.

Why?—Oh, it occurred in the course of conversation.

When did you see Wood next?—About two days afterwards, by appointment, at the Café Royal.

Why should you meet him again?—I had been asked to interest myself in him.

You have heard since that Wood was staying at Taylor's?—No.

Did you not know at the time that Lord Alfred Douglas had met him at Taylor's?—No.

Who told you first that Wood was anxious to leave the country?—Alfred Taylor.

The Solicitor-General then passed on to the time at which Taylor told Wilde that Wood wished to go to America, and Wilde learned through an anonymous letter that his letters to Lord Alfred Douglas had fallen into Wood's hands, and that he (Wilde) was to be blackmailed about them. The witness said that he went to Sir George Lewis about the matter, and that then Taylor came to him and said that Wood was very much distressed and concerned. A meeting was arranged at Little College Street, where the letters were given up to the witness by Wood as soon as he entered the room.

The Solicitor-General:—Where are they?

Witness:—Oh, I tore them up. They were of no importance.

But you gave Wood money for them?—I then gave Wood £15, but it was not as the price of the letters. I had gone prepared to bargain for them if they were worth buying back.

To bargain for what?—For those letters.

And you took money with you for the purpose?—
Yes.

Do you mean on your oath to say that the payment had nothing to do with the delivery of the letters?—
None whatever.

And you got the letters?—Yes.

And gave him luncheon and an additional sum of £5 on the following day?—Yes.

And he went to America?—Yes.

From that time did you hear from him or of him till you saw his name in the plea of justification?—
No.

Do you know a boy named Walter Grainger?—
He was a servant in Lord Alfred Douglas's lodgings at Oxford. He asked me if I would get him a place in London.

Did you find him a place?—Yes.

Where?—In my own house at Goring.

When did he come?—I should think it was in July, 1893. He remained in my service till I left Goring in October.

You have seen him here, I dare say?—Yes.

When you stayed at the Savoy, had you young men there to see you?—The great majority of my friends were young.

Were you ill at the Savoy?—Yes.

You were attended by a masseur?—Yes.

Did the masseur come to you when you were occupying rooms 343 and 346?—Yes.

In reference to the Savoy Hotel evidence, is it true that the masseur and the chambermaid saw boys in your room?—Entirely untrue. No one was there.

There was no one there, man or woman?—No.

You answer also that the chambermaid's statement is untrue?—Absolutely.

The court then adjourned for luncheon.

RE-EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESS

On the court resuming its sitting after the luncheon interval, Sir Edward Clarke rose to re-examine Mr. Wilde.

The first few questions dealt with technicalities concerning the Queensberry trial.

Sir Edward Clarke:—On the cross-examination of yourself in the Queensberry trial, a name was written on paper as the name of the person who introduced Taylor to you. Was that person, whose name was then suppressed, Mr. Schwabe?—Yes.

Is Mr. Schwabe a gentleman of wealth and position?—Yes.

Taylor was well educated, and a clever musician?—A very clever musician. He used to sing and play a great deal at his rooms.

Had you any idea at that time of your acquaintance with Taylor that he was a man addicted to improper practices?—I had no conception whatever—no conception whatever of anything of the kind.

Had you any interest in Wood beyond the fact of Lord Alfred Douglas knowing him?—None, except that Lord Alfred Douglas asked me to take an interest in the young man and be kind to him.

When Wood brought the letters to you did he attempt to get money from you for them?—No. He at once handed me the letters, and said he highly regretted that I should have thought him capable of trying to blackmail me.

Is it then positively untrue that you gave Wood £15 for the letters?—I would not have given him fifteen pence for them. They were of no importance.

Was there anything in them you would object to have known?—There may be people who would regard some of the words as frivolous, but there was nothing in the letters. They were of no importance.

The dinner at Kettner's was a dinner at fixed price. He had been known at Kettner's ever since he left Oxford. He understood that Charles Parker was anxious to go on the stage and that his father was making him an allowance.

This concluded the re-examination of the witness, and Wilde returned to the dock.

•

SIR EDWARD CLARKE'S SPEECH TO THE JURY

•

Sir Edward Clarke began his address to the jury thus:—

Having in my mind the observations which, under some stress of feeling I made in the early part of the day, I may state at the outset that I recognise the admirable fairness with which the Solicitor-General

cross-examined Mr. Wilde. And if earlier in the day I was moved, by what I am glad to think I then described as the momentary forgetfulness of my learned friend yesterday, to expressions which sounded hostile in regard to him, he will let me say at once, in the frankest manner, that the way in which he has cross-examined absolutely destroys any suggestion which might have lain in my words.

Counsel then dwelt upon the fact that Mr. Wilde had invited publicity by his action against the Marquis of Queensberry, and that the statements made by him under cross-examination in that action remained—with one small exception—uncontradicted by independent witnesses. He suggested that the duty of the jury was simple and clear—that when they found a man who was assailed by tainted evidence entering the witness-box, and for a third time giving a clear, coherent, and lucid account of the transactions, such as that which the accused had given, he ventured to say that that man was entitled to be believed against a horde of blackmailers such as they had seen. But there was a larger issue in this matter still. He knew not on what grounds the course had been taken in this case which had been taken by the Crown. He would not quarrel with it nor discuss it, but it was important that if blackmailers were to be listened to against the defendant, then the profession of blackmailing would become a more deadly mischief than ever before.

* Sir Edward, in the course of his speech, uttered a vigorous denunciation of the blackmailing practices of Charles Parker and Wood, and commented

severely on the tender care taken of these witnesses by the Crown.* "This trial," he said, "seems to be operating as an act of indemnity for all blackmailers in London. Wood and Parker, in giving evidence, have established for themselves a sort of statute of limitations. In testifying on behalf of the Crown they have secured immunity for past rogueries and indecencies." It was on the evidence of Parker and Wood the jury were asked to condemn Mr. Wilde. Mr. Wilde knew nothing of the men's characters. They were introduced to him, and it was his love of admiration that caused him to like to be in their society. The positions should be changed—it was these men who ought to be accused, not accusers. It was true that Charles Parker and Wood never made any charge against Mr. Wilde before the plea of justification in the libel case; but what a powerful piece of evidence that was in favour of Mr. Wilde,

* The witnesses for the Crown, in addition to being paid for their attendance at the court, were well clothed and housed. Referring to the fact that Charles Parker was well dressed, the Solicitor-General stated that Messrs. Day and Russell (the solicitors for Lord Queensberry) were obliged to provide the clothes "because the witness could not appear in the Queen's uniform." This witness is said to have had an entire outfit provided for him. On being sent back to his regiment, his Colonel refused to reinstate him. The Treasury thereupon drafted him into another regiment. The Commander-in-Chief, however, refused to allow Parker to be admitted into Her Majesty's Forces under any circumstances. Sir Frank Lockwood explained also that the reason the police so carefully prevented the witnesses from intercourse with anyone (except the friends of the prosecution) was "for fear they should be tampered with." But if the witnesses were reliable and were speaking the truth, surely the prosecution should not have been afraid of them changing their story on coming into contact with the freedom of the outside world. If the Crown had proper corroboration, their witnesses' stories could not have been changed. (See *Gentle Criticisms on British Justice*, by I. Playfair. Part I., pp. 32, published anonymously, 1895.)

for if Charles Parker and Wood thought they had material for making a charge against Mr. Wilde, did the jury think they would not have made it? Did the jury think they would have remained year after year without trying to get something from him? Charles Parker and Wood had made no charge against Mr. Wilde, and did not attempt to get money from him, and that circumstance was one among other cogent proofs to be found in the case that there was no truth whatever in the accusations against Mr. Wilde.

Counsel contended that there was no corroboration of the evidence of Charles Parker and Wood, and that their evidence could not be relied upon; and he also urged that there was nothing to support the counts charging Mr. Wilde with committing the acts alleged with persons whose names were unknown. The jury must not act upon suspicion or prejudice, but upon an examination of the facts, and he respectfully urged that he was entitled to claim a verdict of acquittal.

If on an examination of the evidence the jury felt it their duty to say that the charges had not been proved, Counsel was sure that they would be glad that the brilliant promise which had been clouded by these accusations, and the bright reputation which was so nearly quenched in the torrent of prejudice which a few weeks ago had been sweeping through the Press, had been saved by their verdict from absolute ruin; and that it left him, a distinguished man of letters and a brilliant Irishman, to live among us a life of honour and repute, and to give in the

maturity of his genius gifts to our literature of which he had given only the promise in his early youth.

There was some applause in court on the conclusion of Sir Edward Clarke's speech.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL'S SPEECH FOR THE
PROSECUTION

Sir Frank Lockwood then proceeded to address the jury on behalf of the Crown for the prosecution. He described Sir Edward Clarke's defence as a brilliant one. As regards the hardship said to have been inflicted on Wilde in being cross-examined three times, the Solicitor-General argued that so far from being placed at a disadvantage, there were good grounds for coming to the conclusion that the defendant was now better fitted and readier with his answers than before. It was upon the evidence only that he asked the jury to condemn the accused; but the jury would not appreciate the evidence until they knew what manner of man it was they were dealing with. Who were his associates? He was a man of culture and literary tastes, and Counsel submitted that his associates ought to have been his equals and not these illiterate boys.*

He denied that the prosecution had behaved in any unfairness towards Wilde. He thought that those conducting the prosecution were quite right in thinking that the law officers should be instructed to appear

* According to the authority quoted on p. 433, Sir Frank Lockwood was a personal friend of Oscar Wilde and visited him even after the libel proceedings had begun.

for the prosecution. With regard to the right of reply on behalf of the law officer, and with reference to Sir Edward Clarke's observations that he had never availed himself of that right when he was a law officer, the Solicitor-General said that his learned friend had no right to lay down a rule which could not affect others who filled that office.

The Solicitor-General had got thus far only in his address when the court adjourned till the following morning. Wilde was released on bail as before.

xxii.—THE LAST DAY

Saturday, May 25th, was the last day of the trial. The court was less crowded than on the previous day, the Solicitor-General's speech not being of so much interest as Wilde's cross-examination. As the day wore on, however, the court became packed, and as much interest as ever was shown in the proceedings. Sir Frank Lockwood, who had been interrupted in the middle of his speech on the previous afternoon by the rising of the court, was the first of the Counsel to put in an appearance, and he occupied himself in a last hasty glance through the pages of his brief.

Mr. Oscar Wilde was accompanied by Lord Douglas of Hawick, who sat at the solicitors' table. The Rev. Stewart Headlam, Wilde's other surety, was also in the court. Lord Queensberry occupied a seat near the bench.

At half-past ten Mr. Justice Wills arrived, and Wilde surrendered and took his place in the dock.

SPEECH FOR THE PROSECUTION CONTINUED

The Solicitor-General proceeded at once with his address to the jury. Criticising the answers given by Wilde to the charges, the Solicitor-General submitted that the explanations were not worthy of belief. The jury could not fail to put the interpreta-

tion on the conduct of the prisoner that he was a guilty man, and they ought to say so by their verdict.

As to the statement of Sir Edward Clarke that Wilde himself had courted inquiry into the matter, Sir Frank Lockwood said that that made it necessary for him to recall to the minds of the jury the respective positions of the parties in the Queensberry case. Sir Edward Clarke had contended that Lord Queensberry's libels had referred to events of two years back, and that in the lapse of time witnesses for Mr. Wilde had been lost sight of. But what witness, he asked, had been lost sight of? He suggested that it was the fact that Wilde had seen nothing of Parker, and could rely implicitly on his intimate friend Taylor, that had encouraged him to prosecute Lord Queensberry for libel.

Sir Edward Clarke (interrupting):—I must rise to object to Mr. Solicitor-General's rhetorical descriptions of what has never been proved in evidence, in asserting that an intimate friendship existed between Mr. Wilde and Taylor.

The Solicitor-General:—Gentlemen, it is not rhetoric; it is a plain statement of fact. What are the indications of an intimate friendship? They call each other by their Christian names. Is he not a great friend on his own profession? Does he not say to Taylor: “Bring your friends; they are my friends; I will not inquire too closely whether they come from the stables or the kitchen”? No doubt my learned friend desires now to disconnect them. He wishes as a result of this trial that one should be condemned and

the other left free to continue his grand literary career.

Sir Edward Clarke :—I protest.

The Solicitor-General :—My friend hopes to preserve Wilde by means of a false glamour of art.

Sir Edward Clarke :—My lord, I must protest against this line of argument. I protest strongly against the line the learned Solicitor-General is taking.

The Solicitor-General :—Oh, you may protest.

His Lordship :—So far no mention has been made of the verdict in the other case.

Sir Edward Clarke :—All this is as far removed from the evidence as anything ever heard in this court.

The Solicitor-General :—I am alluding, my lord, and I maintain that I am right in alluding, to my learned friend's last appeal to the jury as to the literary position of his client; and I am dealing in connection with that with his connection with the man Taylor, and I say that these men must be judged equally.

Sir Edward Clarke :—They ought to have been fairly tried in their proper order.

The Solicitor-General :—Oh, my lord, these interruptions should avail my friend nothing.

His Lordship :—Mr. Solicitor is perfectly within his rights. The only objection is to allusions to the result of the trial of Taylor.

The Solicitor-General, continuing, referred to the relations of Mr. Wilde with Lord Alfred Douglas, and to the history of the blackmailing which the letters Wilde wrote to Lord Alfred Douglas had made possible. Referring to the letter containing the words "madness of kisses," the learned Counsel spoke as follows :—

I contend that such a letter found in the possession of a woman from a man would be open to but one interpretation. How much worse is the inference to be drawn when such a letter is written from one man to another. It has been attempted to show that this was a prose poem, a sonnet, a lovely thing which I suppose we are too low to appreciate. Gentlemen, let us thank God, if it is so, that we do not appreciate things of this sort save at their proper value, and that is somewhat lower than the beasts. If that letter had been seen by any right-minded man, it would have been looked upon as evidence of a guilty passion. And you, men of pride, reason, and honour, are tried to be put off with this story of the prose poem, of the sonnet, of the lovely thing.

Sir Frank Lockwood pointed to one or two phrases in particular in the letter, and commented specially on the reference to Apollo and Hyacinthus, which, he declared, sufficiently showed what was in the prisoner's mind when he wrote to Lord Alfred Douglas.

He proceeded to deal with Sir Edward's conduct of the former trial, and a reference to his "candour" provoked a laugh from the public gallery. The Solicitor-General said he had no sympathy with such demonstrations of opinion.

His Lordship:—These interruptions are offensive to me beyond anything that can be described. To have to try a case of this kind, to keep the scales even, and do one's duty is hard enough; but to be pestered with the applause or expressions of feeling of senseless people who have no business to be here, at all,

except for the gratification of morbid curiosity, is too much. I hope that no further interruption of this kind will be heard throughout the rest of the trial. If there is anything of the kind again I shall clear the court.

Continuing, the Solicitor-General said that Wilde did not know, until after Lord Queensberry had been committed for trial and it was too late for the prosecution to retire, that these past chapters in his life were to be opened and read. And it was only when he was subjected to cross-examination by Mr. Carson, and the whole matter was laid open, that the case came to an abrupt termination, and the plea of justification was found to be proved and to have been published in the public interest. Counsel pointed out that had it been possible to deal in that court with offences alleged to have been committed outside the jurisdiction of that court, there would have been other counts in the indictment.

Sir Frank Lockwood then went on to speak of cases, not included in the indictment, with regard to which he had cross-examined the defendant. He said that he had adopted that course because he thought the jury ought to have every opportunity of ascertaining for themselves what manner of man he alleged Wilde to be. He said that Wilde made very large claims on his own behalf by reason of his social position and of his literary distinction, but he (Counsel) pointed to the case of Alphonse Conway as showing how little the defendant valued that position. It was a commonsense conclusion that Wilde bargained with Wood and bought the letters. If what

Wilde said was true as to his first meeting with Wood, all he had to do was to hand over to him the money he was deputed to give, and if he thought there was aught in this young man that appealed to Wilde's own benevolence to add such sum as provided for such refreshment as Wood might desire. Wood had no motive for deceiving the jury on the present occasion.

Counsel described again the story told by Charles Parker, and said that the fact of Wilde never having seen William Parker since the dinner at Kettner's corroborated the evidence of the Parkers as to the conversation which took place at that dinner. There, as in the case of Wood, Wilde's evidence contained admission after admission, until he came to the point at which admission must cease and confession would begin. Counsel pointed to the evidence of the waiter from the Savoy Hotel as corroborating that of Charles Parker. The waiter said that a supper was served to Mr. Wilde and a young man in a private room. Parker had described that supper, and Wilde could give no explanation as to who his guest was—he could say only that it was not Charles Parker. The evidence of Margery Bancroft, who said that she "knew Mr. Wilde perfectly well by sight," also gave corroborative evidence; and so much impressed was she by what she had seen that she complained to Parker's landlady, and Parker—apparently without complaint or remonstrance—was compelled to leave his lodgings. In regard to the Savoy Hotel charges, Counsel asked why was Lord Alfred Douglas, who slept in the next room, not called to deny the state-

ments of the chambermaid. There was no reason why Wilde should not be cross-examined with reference to other offences. The jury were entitled, in the interests of justice, to put a commonsense interpretation upon the conditions and circumstances under which the lads outside the present case were found. The case of the boy Conway was very significant. What possible benefit could it be to a boy in his position to be taken from Worthing to Brighton and allowed to stay in a hotel all night?

Dealing with the cases of the blackmailers, the Solicitor-General drew a distinction between the conduct of Charles Parker and that of Wood. He contended further that a man who had sunk so low as to be willing to state that he had committed indecent acts would not hesitate actually to commit them.

“ My learned friend,” continued Sir Frank Lockwood, “ has said that these witnesses are blackmailers and has warned you against giving a verdict which should enable this detestable trade to rear its head unblushingly in this city. Gentlemen, I should have as much right to ask you to take care lest by your verdict you should enable another vice, as detestable, as abominable, to raise its head with unblushing effrontery in this city. The genesis of the blackmailer is the man who has committed these acts of indecency with him. And the genesis of the man who commits these foul acts is the man who is willing to pay for their commission. Were it not that there are men willing to purchase vice in this most hideous and detestable form there would be no market for such

crime, and no opening for these blackmailers to ply their calling.”*

But where, asked the Solicitor-General, was the motive? It was not suggested that Parker or Wood had blackmailed Mr. Wilde, or that they had been improperly influenced in any way. Counsel went on to discuss the relations which he said had undoubtedly existed between Wilde, Taylor, Wood, and Parker, and he thought it was remarkable that Wilde should have made two acquaintances, one after the other, both of whom were new friends of Taylor, and both in a different social position from Mr. Wilde's own. He urged further that there was distinct corroboration in the case of Wood, and that no motive had been put forward which the jury could reasonably consider might have prompted the witnesses to come and give false evidence. With regard to Taylor, who on the occasion of the first trial was charged by Mr. Carson with procuration on

* This remark of the Solicitor-General seems rather beside the point. The “genesis of the blackmailer” is not so much the man who is willing to pay for the commission of acts of indecency, as the section of the law in the Statute Book rendering the commission of “any act of gross indecency” by two male persons punishable by imprisonment. If the act were not illegal (as it was not until 1886), the trade of the blackmailer would vanish, or, at any rate, be reduced very considerably. As the law now stands, no man, however innocent, is safe from the machinations of these villains, and many an innocent man has submitted to blackmail, exile, and even death, rather than run the risk of being brought to trial on such an accusation. In countries where the *Code Napoléon* is in use, blackmailing is practically unknown, while the vice of “sexual inversion” is no more common in the capitals on the Continent than it is in London. See *A Problem in Modern Ethics*, by John Addington Symonds. Privately printed. London, 1896. This is an exhaustive inquiry into the phenomenon of sexual inversion, and is addressed especially to medical psychologists and jurists.

behalf of Wilde, Counsel pointed out that Taylor had been in court during the Queensberry trial, and yet he had not been put into the witness-box. Why not? Counsel asked.

One would have thought that after the Wood incident, Taylor would have been asked to be careful in the selection of the friends he introduced to Wilde. But no; Taylor had carte blanche to bring any friends he pleased, and it was manifest that the intimacy with Charles Parker was not a matter of ordinary friendship. Counsel repelled the suggestion that Mr. Russell, Lord Queensberry's solicitor, or any of the representatives of the Crown, had given fee or reward to the youths who gave evidence. All the prosecution had done was to take precautions to prevent tampering with those witnesses, and to ensure their attendance in court. Naturally, the witnesses had been removed secretly from place to place, and he made no apology for the course the Crown took in the matter. Charles Parker could have no sinister motive in telling a story involving his own shame, and to some extent his own condemnation, for it had never been shown that Parker, whatever his past conduct might have been, had attempted to extort money from Wilde.

Counsel contended that Wilde's own admissions—which agreed up to a certain point with the evidence of Wood—proved Wood's story to be true. What necessity, the Solicitor-General asked, was there for Mr. Wilde to give Wood supper in a private room or to tell him that his (defendant's) family was out of town? . The subsequent story with regard to Wood

was most extraordinary. The transaction with regard to the letters was, Counsel declared, capable of one construction only. Wilde knew they were letters which he must recover; he bought them and tore them to pieces. He kept the one which he had from Allen because he knew that Mr. Beerbohm Tree had a copy of it, so that it was useless to destroy the original. If the jury came to the conclusion that Wilde did purchase these letters, it threw a flood of light upon his conduct. It showed that he knew the class of men with whom he had been intimate, and with whom he continued to be intimate. Sir Edward Clarke had exaggerated—unintentionally, of course—what his lordship had said with regard to the two cases of the person or persons unknown. His learned friend made it appear as though the evidence in these cases was exceedingly slender; but as a matter of fact his lordship left that part of the case unreservedly to the jury. He (the Solicitor-General) contended that there was ample evidence as to these particular charges. The defendant had given no explanation of the discoveries made by the employees of the hotel. It was no conclusive answer to say that Wilde did everything openly. If crime were always cautious it would always go unpunished, and it was in moments of carelessness that crime was detected. The witnesses from the Savoy Hotel could have no possible object in patching up a bogus case.

Having gone through a somewhat disconnected survey of the evidence, finding everywhere corroboration which he submitted to the jury was fatal to the prisoner, the Solicitor-General concluded as follows :

Now, gentlemen, I have been through the whole of this case. I have pointed out to you its strength, and I have to ask you to do your duty in regard to it. I have already dealt with that—as I think, unfortunate—appeal which my learned friend made as to the literary past or literary future of Oscar Wilde. With that we have in this case nothing whatever to do. He has a right to be acquitted if you believe him to be an innocent man, be his lot high or low. But if, gentlemen, in your consciences you believe that he is guilty of these charges—well, then you have only one consideration, and that is to follow closely the obligation of the oath which has been laid upon you.

The Solicitor-General finished his speech at half-past twelve, and Mr. Justice Wills immediately proceeded to sum up.

THE JUDGE'S SUMMING UP.

His lordship began by explaining to the jury that he had not had a University education.* The case was, he said, a most difficult one, and his task very severe. He would rather try the most shocking murder case than it had ever fallen to his lot to try than be engaged in a case of this description. He dwelt on the horrible nature of the charges, which called, he said, for "the cold, calm, resolute administration of justice." His difficulties and his sense of responsibility were not increased by the social distinction of the defendant. Whatever might be the guilt or innocence of the

* Sir Alfred Wills was educated at Edgbaston Proprietary School and University College, London.

accused, his lordship argued that Wilde had been obliged, from the result of the Queensberry trial, to confess that his conduct, especially with regard to Lord Alfred Douglas, had been such that Lord Queensberry had been justified in applying to him the words contained in the original libel; and it would be impossible for twelve intelligent, impartial, and honest gentlemen to say there was no good ground for an indignant father, a loving and affectionate parent, to charge Wilde with having “posed” as the Marquis of Queensberry had suggested.

Speaking of the conduct of the case, his lordship expressed regret that the charges of conspiracy had ever been introduced; because, while they formed part of the indictment, it was impossible for Sir Edward Clarke to take the course which he had taken on the previous Monday and apply to have the cases of Wilde and Taylor taken separately. In his lordship’s opinion, the joining of the charges against the two prisoners of itself justified the disagreement of the jury. As to the present trial, his lordship would have preferred to try the prisoners in a different order; but he did not think that the defendant had suffered by the course taken by the Solicitor-General, nor that the fact that Taylor’s case had been heard first had in any way prejudiced the case of Wilde. Whatever the verdict of the jury might be, it could not leave things precisely as they were before the trial.

Dealing with the evidence, his lordship said there were three—or substantially, four—charges in the indictment. There were charges of improper conduct with Wood and with Parker, and two charges with

regard to persons at the Savoy Hotel. His lordship continued that he could never bring himself to make a colourless summing up, which was no good to anybody, but he called upon the jury to look upon his opinions not as his views which they were expected to adopt, but as matters for their criticism.

The passing of the Act which made a defendant a competent, but not a compellable witness, was never intended to alter or to infringe upon the sacred old principle of English law that the prosecution must make out the charge against the accused. But for that Act many innocent persons might have been convicted and many guilty persons might have escaped. He had become a convert to the beneficial nature of that Act of Parliament after ten years' experience of its working.

Speaking generally, he must admit—and it was for the jury to say whether he was unduly stretching the remark in favour of the defendant—it was exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, for a man to remember exactly where he was or with whom he was two years ago, and he thought that fact was in favour of the accused, so far as it went. It would be a bad day for the administration of justice in England when juries ceased to take their directions from the judge; or when they surrendered to any judge in the land—no matter what his learning, experience, and ability was—their own independent judgment on the facts which were before them. It was the province of the jury to decide upon the facts.

It was impossible in dealing with Wood's case, he said, to avoid dealing also with Lord Alfred Douglas.

Now, Lord Alfred was ~~not~~ present, and was not a party to those proceedings, and it must be remembered in his favour that if neither side called him he could not volunteer himself as a witness. Anything which his lordship would have to say to Lord Alfred Douglas's prejudice would arise simply out of facts which had transpired in the course of the evidence. He was anxious, too, to say nothing in the case of a young man like this, who was just on the threshold of life, which might to a great extent blast his career. His family seemed to be a house divided against itself. But even if there were no filial love or parental affection, even if there was nothing but hatred between father and son, what father would not try to save his own son from the associations suggested by the two letters from the prisoner to Lord Alfred Douglas? His lordship would avoid saying whether those letters seemed to point to actual criminal conduct or not. They must be considered with relation to the other evidence, and it was for the jury to say whether the contents lent any colour to Wood's story. In itself, the letter produced by the prosecution might be consistent with perfect innocence, and it was not safe to rely upon the letter alone. Wilde claimed to be an exceptional person, and it became a question how much allowance might be allowed for this fact in considering the letter. He himself (the learned judge) might be dull, but he could not see the extreme beauty of the language; but opinions might differ on that point. Suppose that they were "prose poems," suppose that they were things of which the intellectual and literary

value could be appreciated only by persons of high culture, were they the less poisonous for a young man? Was that language calculated to calm and keep down the passions which in a young man would need no stimulus? It was strange that it should not occur to a gentleman capable of writing such letters, that any young man to whom they were addressed must suffer in the estimation of everybody if it were known. Lord Queensberry had drawn from those letters the conclusion that most fathers would draw; though he seemed to have taken a method of interfering, which his lordship thought no gentleman would have taken, in leaving at the defendant's club a card containing a most offensive expression. It was a message which left the defendant no alternative but to prosecute, or to be branded publicly as a man who could not deny a foul charge.

Taking the charges in the order which he had already named, his lordship dealt first with the case of Wood. He described Wood's connection with Wilde, and the ill-assorted friendship between Wood and Lord Alfred Douglas, by whom he was introduced to Wilde, and from whom he received a suit of clothes, the pockets of which contained the letters referred to. His lordship said that he found it more understandable that a lad like Wood should be given cast-off clothes than silver cigarette cases. Lord Alfred Douglas, who was on terms of intimacy with Wood, had just previously to that received a letter, of which it was difficult to speak with calmness, as addressed from one man to another. It was for the jury to consider whether or not that letter was an

indication of unclean sentiments and unclean appetites on both sides. It was a letter upon which ordinary people would be very liable to put an uncomfortable construction.

The Judge further pointed out that Parker and Wood had been introduced to the accused for certain assistance a long time ago, and that though they had been very industrious blackmailers during this interval, yet they had not seen Wilde again nor attempted to make any charge against him until now. This his lordship admitted to be "a most remarkable fact" and "of overwhelming influence."

Again, there was some truth in the aphorism that a man must be judged by the company he keeps. The jury had seen the Parkers, as they had seen Wood, and the same question must arise in their minds. Were those the kind of young men with whom they themselves would care to sit down to dine? Were they the sort of persons one expected to find in the company of men of education? It was a very long time ago for the waiter to remember having served a supper at the Savoy, and the sums which appeared on the bill were high for such a supper. He (the Judge) knew nothing of the Savoy; but he thought "chicken and salad for two, 16/-," very high. He was afraid he would never have supper there himself.

As to Wood's story of the visit to Tite Street, his lordship said that it was remarkable for a man like Mr. Wilde even to foregather with a man of the social position of Wood. But Wilde said he was himself an exceptional person who disregarded social

distinctions; and it was only fair to say that Wilde never professed any liking for Wood—he said he had taken an interest in him simply because he had been asked to.*

If Wood's story of the visit to Tite Street were true, his lordship thought it might have been possible to obtain some corroboration; but this the Counsel for the prosecution had not done. He thought that if Wood had really been in that house, the witness would have been able to give a more detailed description of his visit than he had done in the course of his evidence.† As for the letters which Wood had got possession of, if they really had been harmless why did not Wilde keep them? They would have been useful in answer to such a charge, as he knew, from the value which those men put upon them, might be brought against him. But his lordship doubted very much whether the letters were harmless and trivial. In his lordship's opinion, the stress of the case with regard to Wood depended on the character of the original introduction of Wood to Wilde.

On the question of corroboration, his lordship pointed out that the jury were not expected, because corroboration in cases of such a kind was difficult to obtain, to be satisfied with less corroboration than if it were easy to obtain. But with regard to the

* In more than one instance it was remarked that the Judge, while placing two issues before the jury in fair enough language, yet imparted to his delivery, his tones, and his manner a significance which deprived his statements of that appearance of impartiality which is usually expected of the Bench.

† Sir Alfred Wills lived at 42, Tite Street, Chelsea, not many doors from Wilde's house.

case of Wood, unless the jury felt that his evidence was corroborated they must not act upon it, because Wood was a blackmailer—a person belonging to the vilest type of men which great cities produced.

QUESTIONS FROM THE JURY BOX

The Foreman of the Jury interposed with the following questions:—

In view of the intimacy between Lord Alfred Douglas and Wilde, was a warrant ever issued for the apprehension of Lord Alfred Douglas?

His Lordship:—I should think not. We have not heard of it.

The Foreman of the Jury:—Was it ever contemplated?

His Lordship:—Not to my knowledge. A warrant would in any case not be issued without evidence of some fact, of something more than intimacy. I cannot tell, nor need we discuss that, because Lord Alfred Douglas may yet have to answer a charge. He was not called. There may be a thousand considerations of which we may know nothing that might prevent his appearance in the witness-box. I think you should deal with the matter upon the evidence before you.

The Foreman of the Jury:—But it seems to us that if we are to consider these letters as evidence of guilt, and if we adduce any guilt from these letters, it applies as much to Lord Alfred Douglas as to the defendant.

His Lordship:—Quite so. But how does that

relieve the defendant? Our present inquiry is whether guilt is brought home to the man in the dock. We have got the testimony of his guilt to deal with now. I believe that to be the recipient of such letters and to continue the intimacy is as fatal to the reputation of the recipient as to the sender, but you have really nothing to do with that at present.

The court here adjourned for luncheon, and on the sitting being resumed afterwards, the Judge again dealt with the case of Lord Alfred Douglas.

“ There is a natural disposition to ask,” said Mr. Justice Wills, “ ‘ Why should this man stand in the dock, and not Lord Alfred Douglas?’ But the supposition that Lord Alfred Douglas will be spared because he is Lord Alfred Douglas is one of the wildest injustice—the thing is utterly and hopelessly impossible. I must remind you that anything that can be said for or against Lord Alfred Douglas must not be allowed to prejudice the prisoner; and you must remember that no prosecution would be possible on the mere production of Wilde’s letters to Lord Alfred Douglas. Lord Alfred Douglas, as you all know, went to Paris at the request of the defendant, and there he has stayed, and I know absolutely nothing more about him. I am as ignorant in this respect as you are. It may be that there is no evidence against Lord Alfred Douglas—but even about that I know nothing. It is a thing we cannot discuss, and to entertain any such consideration as I have mentioned would be a prejudice of the worst possible kind.”

Turning to the case of Charles Parker, his lordship

said that some of his previous remarks applied equally here, 'though there were, of course, differences between the two cases. Parker seemed to have been introduced to Wilde by Taylor, and there could be no doubt but that Taylor was a friend of Wilde. But the amount of intercourse between Wilde and Taylor proved by the prosecution was not very great. The admissions made by Wilde as to the innocent nature of his acquaintance with Parker were certainly remarkable, and it was for the jury to decide whether the explanations were satisfactory. If the jury thought that the visit to Park Walk was made out, it was a very strange thing; and it must be remembered that there was nothing to be said against the person who confirmed that part of the case—Margery Bancroft. If anything could have been found against her, it would have been found by the defence. They must therefore recognise that she was not a street walker nor a disreputable woman, and that she had been years in her situation. Her evidence was good because it was difficult to see any wrong motive that she could have in coming forward to blast the reputation of a man. At this point, his lordship said, he was confronted with a difficulty—namely, the rule of law which prevented witness from telling what he or she had heard from some one else. Consequently, it had not transpired what was the full extent of the complaint made by Mrs. Bancroft to the landlady of the house in Park Walk. The jury would have to draw their own inferences from that witness's evidence, and also put what construction they thought most reasonable on Parker's story generally, taken

in conjunction with all the surrounding circumstances.

Nor must it be presumed, his lordship went on, that the mere fact of two men sleeping together was to be punished. Poverty and misery frequently compelled this to happen, and even men and women to sleep together promiscuously. God forbid that he should say that that in itself was to be considered a serious crime. But when they came to a man who was spending £40 or £50 a week it seemed to him astonishing that he should not get at least the whole use of a bed for his money, and it was natural to ask why he did not offer another room to his guest.

The Judge went on to express a wish that medical evidence had been called. It was a loathsome subject, he said, but he made a point of never shrinking from details that were absolutely necessary. The medical evidence would have thrown light on what had been alluded to as marks of grease or vaseline smears. Then, with reference to the condition of the bed, there was the diarrhoea line of defence. That story his lordship said he was not able to appreciate. He had tried many other similar cases, but he had never heard that before. It struck him as being possible; but more than anything else it impressed him with the importance of medical evidence in such a case, which evidence unfortunately they had not had. The worst state of the sheets was not alleged on the night the boy was said to have been seen in the bed by the chambermaid. There was the same sort of thing, said the woman, but not so bad.

But the evidence of the Savoy Hotel servants, after a long lapse of time, must not be entirely relied upon,

continued his lordship. If a servant noticed anything wrong and said nothing about it for two years, he would not consider that as evidence on which he would hang a dog. It was, his lordship thought, a strange thing that this should not be made a matter of inquiry till two years afterwards. Then, again, the evidence of Migge, the masseur, was remarkable, but it was not safe to rely on it. The evidence of the woman was no less extraordinary, no matter from what point it was viewed. The thing that struck his lordship as most remarkable about that story was that, though the housekeeper was acquainted with what had been seen, absolutely no notice was taken of the circumstance. Why, she became an accomplice in the whole affair, and—without saying she was as bad as any of them—it was a very great breach in her sense of right in those matters.

He pointed out that she had admitted that Cotter, the chambermaid, had made communications to her, and he considered that if she was informed of the condition of the room, and of the boy having been seen in the bed, and if she yet took no steps to prevent such a thing in the future, she was liable to become an accessory before the fact in the event of its being repeated. It was a condition of things one shuddered to contemplate in a first-class hotel; and if it could be assumed that such practices could be tolerated with a man who, it seemed, was running up a bill of £50 a week, then it would look as if we were coming to a state of society when it would be possible to have a magnificently built place of accommodation on the Thames Embankment.

Having considered the whole evidence, he concluded that the question was whether there was evidence of guilt or of suspicion only, and that question would have to be answered by the jury, whom he desired to thank for the patience displayed throughout the prolonged hearing.

THE JURY RETIRE

At half-past three the members of the jury retired to consider their verdict. A hum of conversation immediately filled the court. Wilde was taken down to the cells again, and at the same time Lord Douglas of Hawick and Mr. Stewart Headlam went out. Some witnesses who had given evidence were still waiting outside, but they did not appear in court.

It was generally anticipated when the jury retired that there would be a second disagreement, and that the Crown would afterwards issue a *nolle prosequi*. Every minute that the jury remained absent strengthened this opinion, for indecision portended disagreement. The Solicitor-General is said to have remarked to Sir Edward Clarke, "You'll dine your man in Paris to-morrow," which would seem to show what verdict was expected by Sir Frank Lockwood, a lawyer experienced in verdicts. But Wilde's Counsel was less hopeful, and replied, "No, no, no." At the end of an hour the jury sent out for a bottle of water, and at 5.30 a request for writing materials was made. A few minutes later the jury sent a note to the Judge, who returned into court at once. The

jury having taken their seats in the box, and the defendant again being placed in the dock, the foreman of the jury asked his lordship to read his notes of the evidence of the waiter, Thomas Price, as to the alleged visits of Charles Parker to Wilde's rooms at 10, St. James's Place. The Judge did so; but the passage involved no serious or damning statements. There was evidence, he said, as to only one of the counts in reference to St. James's Place. His lordship added a few words, which seemed to imply that this part of the evidence was not essentially important. It will be remembered that in the previous trial the jury had stated that misconduct between Wilde and Parker at the Savoy Hotel had not been proved to their satisfaction. If therefore the jury had doubts now about the evidence concerning St. James's Place, it seemed that the counts in the indictment charging misconduct with Parker would follow those in which Shelley and Atkins were named. That practically would leave only the counts concerning the witness Wood. Another charge certainly remained quite apart from those of the professional accusers; but that was a suggestion of the vaguest suspicion only, and the Judge had stated openly that he would not hang a dog on such testimony. For a moment or two the jury remained in whispered consultation, and it appeared probable that they would be able to agree on a verdict—or announce that they could not agree—without leaving the box again. But some new difficulty arose and they again retired, though this time they were absent for a few minutes only.

THE VERDICT

The jury returned to their seats, and Wilde was placed once more in the dock.

The Clerk of Arraigns :—Gentlemen, have you agreed upon your verdict?

The Foreman of the Jury :—We have.

The Clerk of Arraigns :—Do you find the prisoner at the bar guilty of an act of gross indecency with Charles Parker at the Savoy Hotel on the night of his first introduction to him?

The Foreman of the Jury :—*Guilty*.

2. Do you find him guilty of a similar offence a week later?—*Guilty*.

3. Do you find him guilty of the offence at St. James's Place?—*Guilty*.

4. Do you find him guilty of this offence at about the same period?—*Guilty*.

~~5.~~ Do you find him guilty of a similar offence with Alfred Wood at Tite Street?—*Guilty*.

6. Do you find him guilty of the offence in Room No. 362 of the Savoy Hotel?—*Guilty*.

7. Do you find him guilty of the offence in Room No. 346 of the Savoy Hotel?—*Guilty*.

Do you find him guilty on all counts in the indictment except that relating to Edward Shelley?—Yes; *Not Guilty* on that count.

SIR EDWARD CLARKE'S APPLICATION

Alfred Taylor being placed in the dock beside Oscar Wilde, Sir Edward Clarke rose and said: I

have to suggest to your lordship that you will not pass sentence until the next Sessions. There is a demurrer on record which has to be argued, and I submit that it would be well to postpone passing sentence in order that that argument may be considered.

Mr. Grain :—I do not know how far that will affect the case of Mr. Taylor, but I think it would affect him equally. Therefore, if I may re-echo the observation of Sir Edward Clarke, I would make the same application.

The Solicitor-General :—I oppose the application. The matter has been argued and decided. It relates to certain counts not included in this indictment; and passing sentence now can in no way affect any argument that may be raised at any future time.

Sir Edward Clarke :—The conspiracy counts are contained in the indictment.

The Judge :—But there is a verdict of *Not Guilty* on them. What is the contention?

Sir Edward Clarke :—That the indictment was bad, there being a different mode of trial. In a case of conspiracy the defendants are not capable of being witnesses, but in the other they are capable of giving evidence, and they plead to that indictment alone. The demurrer is just as arguable, whatever has taken place since.

Mr. Gill :—That question was argued before Mr. Justice Charles, and he held the indictment to be perfectly good.

The Solicitor-General :—Sentence can be passed without prejudicing the argument before the Court of Crown Cases Reserved.

The Judge:—Of the correctness of the indictment I have myself no doubt. But, in any case, my passing sentence will not interfere with the arguing of the point raised, and I think it my duty to pass sentence at once. It is not a matter about which I entertain any doubt; and to pass sentence now will in no sense prejudice the result of the inquiry. I think it may be well to complete the proceedings here on other counts.

THE SENTENCE

Sir Alfred Wills, Knight, one of the Justices of Her Majesty's High Court, in passing sentence, spoke as follows:—

“ Oscar Wilde and Alfred Taylor, the crime of which you have been convicted is so bad that one has to put stern restraint upon one's self to prevent one's self from describing, in language which I would rather not use, the sentiments which must rise to the breast of every man of honour who has heard the details of these two terrible trials.

“ That the jury have arrived at a correct verdict in this case I cannot persuade myself to entertain the shadow of a doubt; and I hope, at all events, that those who sometimes imagine that a judge is half-hearted in the cause of decency and morality because he takes care no prejudice shall enter into the case, may see that that is consistent at least with the utmost sense of indignation at the horrible charges brought home to both of you.

“ It is no use for me to address you. People who

can do these things must be dead to all sense of shame, and one cannot hope to produce any effect upon them. It is the worst case I have ever tried. That you, Taylor, kept a kind of male brothel it is impossible to doubt. And that you, Wilde, have been the centre of a circle of extensive corruption of the most hideous kind among young men, it is equally impossible to doubt.

"I shall, under such circumstances, be expected to pass the severest sentence that the law allows. In my judgment it is totally inadequate for such a case as this.

"The sentence of the court is that each of you be imprisoned and kept to hard labour for two years."

The scathing comments of the Judge, after the moderation of his summing up, and the severity of the sentence imposed, caused considerable sensation in the court, and cries of "Oh! Oh!" and "Shame!" were heard. Taylor appeared to receive his sentence with calm indifference, but Wilde seemed to feel his position very acutely. He made a movement as if he wished to appeal to the Judge, but warders hurried him out of sight, and he was not heard to make any definite application.

The Judge then turned to the jury and, after thanking them for the great care and attention they had bestowed upon the case, exempted them from further service for a period of years.

Meanwhile the court quickly emptied. The journalist rushed off to pen his leading article, and the hypocrite hastened away to prepare the foulness of the public placard. In the street outside, the Old

Bailey, harlots lifted their skirts and danced with delight to the vociferous cheers of the ever-virtuous British public. Newsboys were shouting "Wilde Verdict" almost before the Judge had left the bench.

On an analysis of the counts of the indictment on which a verdict of *Guilty* was returned, it will be seen that there were four charges of misconduct with Parker, one with Wood, and two with "persons unknown." Wilde was therefore convicted on the evidence of two blackmailers and some hysterical servant girls. The former had been described by the Judge as belonging to a gang of the vilest type of men produced by great cities; the evidence of the latter, his lordship declared, was not fit to hang a dog upon. With the dismissal of the Shelley charges, the prosecution had no other evidence to rely on, and it was apparently sufficient to satisfy the jury.

Of the method of conducting the trial, and of its incidents, Sir Edward Clarke had good reason to complain. Charges were brought against Wilde which even the Judge (who, on the whole, impartially tried the case) stigmatised as unfair. There was an unnecessary virulence in the tone of the Solicitor-General. He was the State's official prosecutor, but the State should not be vindictive, and its representative should display the dignity and judicial temper of a great nation which does not seek to hound a man on to his ruin, but to lay the facts in the fullest and clearest way before a jury, leaving them to decide on the trustworthiness of the evidence.

No one, too, will question the indecorousness of the Marquis of Queensberry remaining in court a

spectator of one of the most painful scenes the Old Bailey has ever witnessed. Mr. Justice Wills's remarks as to the means by which Lord Queensberry forced the matter to an issue were none too severe. The leaving of the libellous card at Wilde's club was undoubtedly an act as vulgar as can be conceived. Altogether there remained an uneasy and just suspicion in the minds of a large portion of the community that the prosecution had resorted to means to obtain a conviction which did not square with an Englishman's notion of justice and fair play. Some of the leading London newspapers published a correspondence on the subject for some weeks.

On the Monday after his conviction Wilde was removed to Pentonville Prison, and later to Wandsworth. On November 13th following he was taken to Reading under humiliating circumstances, which he has described in "De Profundis," and there he served the remainder of his sentence. He was released on Wednesday morning, May 19th, 1897, from Pentonville Prison, having been removed from Reading the previous evening, according to the prison regulation which enacts that a prisoner must be discharged from the place to which he was first committed after his conviction. He crossed to the Continent that day, and remained abroad for the last few years of his life. He died in Paris on November 30th, 1900.

PETITIONS

Petition I. was prepared in November, 1895, for presentation to the Home Secretary to obtain Wilde's early release. It was not intended to issue the petition for general circulation, the idea being to obtain the signatures of a few eminent persons in high positions in the Church and the learned professions whose calling and character would have placed them beyond the suspicion of having any prejudice in favour of the prisoner or of any laxity of view with regard to offences of the kind for which Wilde was convicted. The petition was drawn up in writing. It was signed by Frederick York Powell, Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford, and the signatures of other influential men were promised. Petition II. was printed, but neither was ever presented as information was received from the Home Secretary in a letter, dated September 24, 1896, to the effect "that the case of this prisoner has been the subject of careful enquiry and consideration and that, as a result, he has come to the conclusion that no grounds, medical or other, exist which would justify him in advising any mitigation of the sentence."

The petition was thereupon abandoned.

PETITIONS

I.

To The Queen's Most Excellent Majesty

The Humble Petition of the Undersigned

SHEWETH

That Oscar Fingall O'Flahertie Wills Wilde was convicted on the 25th May, 1895, under the 11th Section of The Criminal Law Amendment Act, and was sentenced to a term of two years' imprisonment with hard labour :

That having regard to the nature of the case, Your Petitioners* humbly submit that the Prisoner has already suffered a punishment equivalent to any penalty which the legislature intended to inflict under the before mentioned Act for offences of this Class. And further that if the Prisoner should survive, and complete his sentence, it is greatly to be feared he would ultimately be incapacitated from following his profession, and thus would be deprived, in the prime of life, of the means of earning a livelihood :

Your Petitioners humbly pray that Your Majesty's merciful consideration may be extended to a Prisoner who

* An alternative reading suggested was—" . . . being for the most part engaged in the practice of Literature and the Arts, and considering the Prisoner's eminence as a man of Letters and especially as a dramatic writer, humbly submit that the Prisoner has already suffered a punishment that satisfies the requirements of justice . . . "

must feel the weight of so terrible a punishment in a disproportionate degree to that which would be experienced by one not accustomed to work entirely, as in the Prisoner's case, with his brain :

And Your Petitioners will ever pray.

II.

To The Queen's Most Excellent Majesty

The Humble Petition of the Undersigned

SHEWETH

That Oscar Wilde was convicted on the 25th of May, 1895, under the 11th section of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, and was sentenced to a term of two years' imprisonment with hard labour :

That considering the position of the Prisoner as a man of letters, and especially as a dramatic writer, Your Petitioners, being for the most part engaged in the practice of literature and the arts, humbly submit that the Prisoner has already suffered a punishment sufficient to satisfy the requirements of justice: And this your Petitioners believe having regard to the Report of Your Majesty's Departmental Committee on Prisons, bearing date the 10th of April, 1895, wherein it is stated, paragraph 44, page 18, as follows :

“ We considered whether the power to earn remission of sentence should be extended from convict to local prisons. It is difficult to see the logic or the advantage of allowing a three-year convict to earn a remission of one-fourth of his sentence, and of forbidding a local prisoner, sentenced for eighteen months

"or two years, to earn any remission. We suggest
"that the system might be extended to local prisoners
"sentenced to the longer periods. . . ."

And having regard to the fact that this Prisoner's sentence was for the longest period, your Petitioners humbly pray that Your Majesty's merciful consideration may be extended to a Prisoner who must feel the weight of so terrible a punishment much more than one not accustomed to work entirely, as in the Prisoner's case, with his brain.

And Your Petitioners will ever pray.

INDEX

The names of witnesses are printed in small capitals. An asterisk () indicates a reference to a footnote.*

A

"A House of Pomegranates," 168, 169,* 386.
"A Problem in Modern Ethics," 444.*
"A Rebours," 21, 50, 265.
"A Woman of No Importance," 26, 31, 167, 385.
Abrahams, Bernard Emanuel, 14.
Albemarle Club, 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 18, 23, 30, 33, 34, 39, 412, 451, 466.
— Hotel, 41, 58, 86, 156, 168, 171, 172, 196, 200, 234, 235, 237, 243, 277, 303, 311, 384, 391, 425.
Street, 1,* 2,* 23, 41, 86, 91, 92, 375.
Albion Hotel, Worthing, 61, 62, 425.
Alderney Street, 230, 360.
Alexander, John, 145, 181.
Algiers, 11.
Alhambra, The, 219, 242, 282, 309, 357.
Aller, Detective-Sergeant, 132, 172, 173.
— William (*alias* Pea), 17, 25, 26, 34-36, 55-57, 114, 202, 205, 215, 216, 221, 223, 224, 307, 308, 339, 391-394, 446; sentenced for blackmailing, 56,* 360.*
America, United States of :

Mr. Beerbohm Tree's cable from, 113; Mr. John Lane's cable from, 100;* Parker's (Charles) desire to go to, 340; Visitors from, 230; Wilde's lectures in, 33; — plays in, 135; Wood's visit to, 21, 35, 55, 89, 155, 174, 205, 207, 212, 213, 215, 216, 221-224, 279, 307, 308, 344, 360, 382, 393, 407, 428, 429.
"An Ideal Husband," 106, 135, 414.
Anderton's Hotel, 230.
APPLEGATE, MARY, 170, 233.
Aquarium, Scarborough, 231.
"Art and Morality," 48.*
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry, Q.C., M.P., 129.
ATKINS, FREDERICK (*alias* Dennis Denny, St. Denis), 57,* 64, 66, 67, 74, 81-85, 89, 149, 163, 166,* 171, 180, 196, 197, 201, 207, 216, 225, 233, 275, 276, 286, 288-290, 297, 303-306, 308, 313, 316, 323, 357, 460; gives evidence, 164-167, 216-218, 225-232, 240-243, 289, 290, 297, 306.
Australia, 85, 426.
Avondale Hotel, 85, 425.
Avory, Horace Edmund, 159, 191, 210, 225, 237, 255, 260, 331, 349, 380, 396, 403.

Babbacombe, 51.

Bail, Queensberry released on, 3, 6, 14, 62, 115; refused to Wilde, 133, 158, 175, 183, 184, 317; refused to Taylor, 175, 183, 317; Shelley applies to Wilde for, 220; Wilde released on, 319-322, 335, 395, 407, 436.

BANCROFT, MARGERY, 144, 310, 383, 442, 456; gives evidence, 160, 170, 210, 401.

Barford, Harry, 171, 225, 227.

Beard, Thomas George, 16, 187, 329.

BECKER, EMILE, 383, 442; gives evidence, 345, 400.

Bell, John Charles, 15, 187, 320.

Berkeley Hotel and Restaurant, 104.

Besley, Edward Thomas Edmonds, Q.C., 22, 117.

Birmingham, 217, 229.

"Blackwood's Magazine," 62.*

Bodley Head, 168, 172, 381, 384, 388, 390: *see also* Vigo Street.

Bond Street, 174, 243, 341, 373. " Bookman, The," 97.*

Bow Street Police Court and Station, 130, 131, 133, 134, 172, 177, 188, 190, 195, 206, 210, 246, 247, 292, 320, 321, 336: Wilde and Taylor charged at, 141-159, 160-175, 176-184.

Bridge, Sir John, 130, 131, 141, 146, 151-154, 159, 160-162, 164, 173, 178, 181-183, refuses bail to Wilde and Taylor, 158, 175, 184.

Brighton, 41, 61, 236, 280, 350, 425-427, 443.

Broadstairs, 56.*

BROCKWELL, THOMAS, 130, 131, 320; gives evidence, 173, 174, 247, 402.

Bromley Terrace, Greenwich, 393.

BROOKS, REGINALD, 180.

Brougham, Wilfrid Francis: *see* Day, Russell and Co.

Brunswick Square, 356, 383.

Buchanan, Robert, 250,* 272.

Buckingham Palace Road, 133, 232.

Burton, James Dennis (*alias* Watson), 166, 174, 207, 217, 218, 228-232, c241-243, 289, 306.

Bush, Warder, 160.

C

Cadogan Hotel, Wilde's arrest at the, 128, 132-134, 141, 172, 247, 402.

Café Royal, 8, 24, 28, 34, 37, 40, 54, 59, 79, 82, 103, 104, 153, 155, 168, 174, 191, 211, 307, 344, 382, 427, 428.

Cairo, 37.

Calais, 278, 279.

Camera Square, Chelsea, 79, 90,* 144, 149, 190, 202, 206, 224, 340, 395, 425.

Carew, *alias* of Cliburn.

Carson, Edward Henry, Q.C., 4, 7, 9-13, 18, 19, 22, 63, 68, 123, 189, 301, 403, 441; addresses the jury, 107-115, 117-122; cross-examines Wilde, 12, 40-62, 70-90; defends Lord Queensberry, 4-14, 19-62, 63-127.

Carter's Hotel, 2, 7, 91, 92, 95, 134.

Cave, Hon. Sir Lewis William, 409.

Central Criminal Court: *see* Old Bailey.

"Chameleon, The," 18, 20, 31, 39, 41, 42,* 44-46, 106, 111, 124, 135, 175, 259, 264, 269, 279, 298-302.

Chandos Street, 31.

Chapel Street, Chelsea, 65, 74, 149, 169, 170, 179, 199, 206, 210, 248, 281, 337, 345, 401, 402.

Charges withdrawn against
Wilde and Taylor, 188, 258-
261, 277, 293, 315, 316, 344,
345, 405, 406, 411.

Charing Cross, 392.

Charles, Hon. Sir Arthur,
D.C.L., 185-188, 191, 193,
218, 220, 241, 243, 249-251,
253, 254, 256, 258-261, 272,
293, 294, 311-318, 378, 406,
462; his summing-up, 295-
311.

Chelsea, 388, 426: *see also*
Camera Square, Chapel
Street, D'Oyley Street,
Regent Street, Tite Street.

Chiswick, 395.

Cigarette cases, 61, 65, 67, 79,
84-86, 89, 148, 156, 166, 174,
175, 200, 217, 227, 233, 234,*
243, 275, 383, 421, 426, 451.

CLARIDGE, GEORGE FREDERICK,
174, 243.

Clarke —, 340, 341.
— Sir Edward George,
Q.C., M.P., 16, 22, 23, 117,
188, 191-194, 214, 235-243,
255-260, 279, 301, 331, 362,
379, 436, 438, 439, 446, 459,
461; applications on behalf
of Wilde, 314, 317, 332, 335,
461; defends Wilde, 160-167,
191-201, 380-435; prosecutes
for Wilde, 16-107; withdraws
from the case, 122-125;
speeches to the jury, 23-32,
261-267, 283-291, 410-414,
431-435.

Cleveland Street, 90.

Cliburn (or Clibborn), Robert
(alias) Carew, Collins,
Harris, Robertson, Stephen-
son, 17, 25, 26, 36, 57, 205,
207; sentenced for black-
mailing, 56,* 360.*

Cockburn, Rt. Hon. Sir Alex-
ander James Edmund, Bart.
(Lord Chief Justice), 12.

Code Napoléon, 444.*

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, 262,
299.

Collins, *alias* of Cliburn.
— Hon. Sir Richard
Henn, 15, 16, 22, 70, 116,
127, 274, 378, 400.

Commission of Oyer and Ter-
miner, 15, 187, 329.

Common Sergeant: *see* Sir J.
Forrest Fulton.

Constantinople, 282.

Conway, Alphonse, 22, 60, 61,
90, 102, 110, 118, 121, 122,
278, 298, 426, 427, 441, 443.

COTTER, JANE MARGARET, 306,
344, 382, 430, 458; gives
evidence, 157, 245, 246, 345,
398.

Court —, 354, 355.

Court, Central Criminal: *see*
Old Bailey.

Court of Bankruptcy, 281, 347,
350, 362.
— of Crown Cases Re-
served, 256, 400, 462.
— of Queen's Bench, 184.

Covent Garden, 282, 352.

Crawford Street, 90,* 202.

Craigie, Mrs.: *see* John Oliver
Hobbes.

Criminal Law Amendment
Act (1885), 142, 192-195, 256,
330, 380; its history, 135-137.

Criterion, The, 229.

Cromer, 34, 41, 59, 236, 425.

Crystal Palace, 143, 149.

Cuffe, Hon. Hamilton John
Agmondesham, C.I. (Public
Prosecutor), 129, 130, 161,
195, 349.

D

“Daily Chronicle, The,” 98.
“Daily News, The,” 389.

Dalziel's Agency, 82.

Datchet, 77, 341.

Daventry, 56.*

David and Jonathan, The love
of, 271.

Davies, Lieut.-Col. Horatio
David, 15, 22, 187, 329.

Day, Edward Francis: *see*
Day, Russell and Co.

Day, Russell and Co., 7, 56,* 153,* 180.
 " De Profundis," 57,* 466.
 Denbigh Place, 172, 174, 246.
 Dennis, Denny, *aliases* of Atkins and Burton.
 Dickens, Charles, 299.
 Digby, Inspector Thomas, 134.
 Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield, 15, 187.
 Douglas, John Sholto : *see* Marquis of Queensberry.
 —— Lord Alfred Bruce, 4, 7, 12, 19, 22, 24-28, 33, 34, 40-42, 51-53, 60, 85, 86, 103, 105, 107, 128, 130, 156, 165, 190, 191, 225, 233, 246, 273, 276, 278, 279, 285, 306, 307, 311, 377, 382, 391, 394, 398, 412, 414, 415, 419, 425, 427, 428, 431, 439, 442, 448-451, 455; correspondence with his father, 8-11, 67, 68, 91-97, 104; his letters from Oscar Wilde, 14, 19, 21, 25-28, 34-38, 51-53, 63, 64, 70, 74, 111-115, 155, 163, 191, 205, 212, 213, 216, 269, 273, 279, 285, 293, 300, 301, 308, 343, 360, 382, 393, 403, 416-418, 428, 429, 439, 440, 450-455; tries to bail Oscar Wilde, 134.
 —— of Hawick and Tibbers, Lady, 374-377.
 —— Lord (Percy Sholto), 4, 22, 33, 85, 128, 331, 372, 408, 412, 437, 459; bails Oscar Wilde, 321; charged at Marlborough Street, 373-377.
 Dover Street, 41.
 D'Oyley Street, 203.
 Driver —, 232.
 Drumlanrig, Viscount : *see* Kelhead.
 Dublin, 33, 268.
 Durabach —, 341.

E
 Earl's Court Exhibition, 59.

" Echo, The," 132.
 Edgbaston Proprietary School, 447.*
 Edgware Road, 360.*
 Egypt, 8, 37.
 Ellis, Sir John Whittaker, Bart., 15.
 Ely Place, 128.
 Empire, The, 282, 300, 357.
 Evans, Sir David, K.C.M.G., 15, 187.
 " Evening News, The," Oscar Wilde's letter to, 130.
 Extradition Act, 409.*
 —— Court, 141, 177.

F
 Fabian Society, 324.
 Fitzroy Square and Street, 64, 66, 74, 98, 99,* 103, 109, 149, 163, 164, 282, 310, 338, 339, 342, 359.
 Fleet Street, 230, 361.
 Florence Restaurant, 54, 55, 73, 89, 154, 155, 165, 166, 211, 213, 226, 304-307, 338, 360, 382, 427.
 Frayling, F. G., 176, 331, 349.
 Fulton, Sir J. Forrest, Q.C., 15, 56,* 187, 329, 360.*

G
 Gay and Bird, 31, 135.
 Gaze's Hotel, Nice, 230.
 " Gentle Criticisms on British Justice," 433,* 435.*
 Germany, 418.
 Gill, Arthur Edmund, 18, 22, 117, 191, 254, 260.
 Gill, Charles Frederick, 7, 18, 22, 117, 127, 142, 145, 151, 161, 164, 176-178, 181, 186, 189-192, 216, 224, 235, 238, 248, 250-255, 258, 259, 285, 293, 314, 315, 317-319, 342, 349, 369, 380, 398, 403, 408, 413; cross-examines Oscar Wilde, 268-279; —— Taylor, 281, 282; examines wit-

nesses, 145-158, 164-173, 178-180, 197-201, 207-213, 233-236, 337-339, 384, 394, 398, 399; speeches for the prosecution, 192, 193, 194-197, 292-294; withdraws various charges of conspiracy, 259-261.

Giltspur Chambers, Holborn, 1, 104.

Ginger, nickname of Wilde's servant, 90.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. William Ewart, M.P., 68, 94.

Gloucester Square, 3.

Goff, *alias* of Marling, 360.*

Goring, 24, 34, 74, 88, 180, 425, 429.

Gracechurch Street, 135.

Grain, John Peter, 177, 186, 190, 192, 201, 206, 218, 225, 231, 235, 244, 246, 259, 267, 280, 282, 331, 333, 339, 341, 343, 345-348, 349, 355, 362, 360, 462; speeches to jury, 291, 292, 363, 364.

Grainger, Walter, 67, 86-88, 103, 298, 429.

GRANT, ELLEN, 153,* 337, 351; gives evidence, 151-153, 208, 209, 345.

GRAY, SOPHIA, 180, 361; gives evidence, 170, 210, 345, 346, 402.

Green, Frank, 15.

Greenwich, 393.

GREET, INSPECTOR, 2, 3, 13.

Gully, Rt. Hon. William Court, Q.C., M.P.: *see* The Speaker.

H

Hall, Sir Charles, Q.C., M.P., K.C.M.G., 15, 187, 329, 331. — William Clarke, 317, 331.

Hand, George, 16, 187, 329, 331.

Hannay, James Lennox, 99,* 373, 376, 377.

Hanson, Sir Reginald, Bart., M.P., 22, 187, 329, 331.

Harrington, Edward, 163, 206, 339, 353-356, 364, 427.

Harris, Robert Henry, *alias* of Cliburn. — Sir Augustus, 175. — William, 173, 246.

Hawick and Tibbers: *see* Lord Douglas.

Haymarket Theatre, 26, 57, 106, 135.

Headlam, Rev. Stewart Duckworth, 321, 324, 325, 331, 371, 408, 437, 450.

Henry, Harold, 355.

Hobart Place, 133.

Hobbes, John Oliver, 59.*

Hogarth Club, 59.

Holborn Viaduct Hotel, 128, 130.

Holker, Sir John (Lord of Appeal), 413.

Holloway, 224. — Prison, 158, 160, 177, 184, 214, 237, 244, 321, 340.

Hopwood, Charles Henry, Q.C., M.P., 137.

Hotels, Restaurants, etc.: Albemarle, Albemarle Street, W.; Albion, Worthing; Anderton's, Fleet Street; Avondale, 68a, Piccadilly; Berkeley, Piccadilly; Cadogan, 75, Sloane Street; Café Julien, Paris; Café Royal, 68, Regent Street, W.; Carter's, 14 and 15, Albemarle Street; Florence, 1 and 58, Rupert Street; Gaze's, Nice; Grand, Paris; Holborn Viaduct, E.C.; Keitner's, 28-31, Church Street, Soho; Marine, Worthing; Metropole, Brighton; Midland, St. Pancras; New Inn, Edgware Road; St. James's Restaurant, 24-28, Piccadilly; Savoy, Strand; Solferino, 7 and 8, Rupert Street; Victoria, Northumberland Avenue, W.C.; Willis's Rooms, 26, King Street, S.W.

House of Commons, 135-137.

Houses of Parliament, 135, 146, 277.

Howard Ebenezer, 181, 245.

Humphreys, Charles Octavius, 1-4, 7-13, 146, 319.

— C. O., Son, and Kershaw, 1, 105, 185; their correspondence with Lord Queensberry, 104-106.

— Robert Hughes, 241.

— Travers, 22, 117, 142, 149, 154, 160-162, 167, 175, 176, 181, 183, 191, 320, 321, 331, 380, 408.

Hunter Street, 356, 383.

“Importance of Being Earnest, The,” 17, 29, 39, 135, 234,* 324, 325.

Independent Theatre, 59, 168, 274, 384.

James, Sir Henry, M.P., 137. Jarome, Jerome Klapka, 175.

K

Kane, Detective-Sergeant, 99.*

KEARLEY, FREDERICK, 179, 209, 210, 250, 402.

Kelhead, Francis Archibald Douglas, Viscount Drumlanrig, Lord, 33, 94, 108.

Kerr, Robert Malcolm, 15.

Kershaw, Leonard William, 192.

Kershaw, James Francis: *see* C. O. Humphreys, Son, and Kershaw.

Kettner's Restaurant, 59, 64, 73, 76-78, 85, 89, 143, 147, 149, 156, 168, 200, 233, 282, 309, 365, 383, 388, 397, 423, 425, 431, 442.

“King Lear,” 51.

King's Road, Brighton, 41.

Knightsbridge, 180, 206, 360. Knill, Sir Stuart, Bart., 15, 187, 329, 331.

L

Labouchere, Henry Du Pré, M.P., 136, 137.

“Lady Windermere's Fan,” 101, 324, 387.

Lancing, 60.

Lane, John, 99, 100,* 172, 239, 240, 388-390.

Langham Street, 154, 212.

Lawrence, Sir James Clarke, Bart., 187.

Lehmann, John William, 181, 245.

LEITH, THEODORE, 180.

Lennox Gardens, 229.

Letters, post-cards, telegrams, etc.: Douglas to Queensberry, 92, 104; Humphreys to Queensberry, 104, 105; Mason to Taylor, * 361; Parker to Wilde, 80, 425; Queensberry to Humphreys, 105, 106; to Lady Douglas of Hawick, 375; to Lord Alfred Douglas, 91, 92, 94-96; to Montgomery, 93, 94; Russell to Public Prosecutor, 129; Shelley to Wilde, 238, 239, 275, 386-389; Taylor to Mavor, 173; to Wilde, 173; Ward, Perks and Co. to the Press, 135; Wilde to Lord Alfred Douglas, 27, 53, 418; to Taylor, 73, 74, 180, 337, 357; to the “Evening News,” 130.

Lewes, 56.*

Lewis, Angus Scott, LL.B., 130, 131, 142, 161, 176, 320, 331, 340.

— Sir George Henry, 1-3, 7, 128, 223, 279, 428.

“Lippincott's Magazine,” 20, 40, 47-51, 263.

Little College Street, 54, 63, 70, 73, 74, 110, 113, 143, 144,

146, 151, 153,* 154, 156, 165, 170, 179, 196, 198, 199, 201, 207, 209, 210, 224, 233, 234, 246, 278, 282, 291, 307, 309, 310, 336-338, 343-345, 350, 351, 354, 356, 364, 381, 394, 397, 419, 424, 427, 428.
 Littlechild, ex-Inspector, 16, 173, 224, 248, 351, 364.
 Lloyd, Constance Mary: *see* Mrs. Oscar Wilde.
 Lloyd, Horatio, Q.C., 24.
 Lockwood, Sir Frank, Q.C., 120, 270,* 331-335, 345, 349, 355, 369-371, 380, 404-409, 412, 433,* 435,* 459, 465; cross-examines Alfred Taylor, 351-363; — Wilde, 415-430; examines witnesses, 341, 343, 394; speeches to jury, 335-337, 364-366, 380-384, 435-447.
 London and Westminster Bank, 128, 174, 180.
 Lord Mayor: *see* Sir Joseph Renals.
 Loughlin, Police-Constable, 374.
 Louys, Pierre, 28,* 36.
 Lush, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert (Lord Justice), 12.
 Lyell, John Ronaldson, 13.
 Lyric Club, 59.

M

McCarthy, Inspector, 360.*
 McKay, William: *see* Ward, Perks and McKay.
 Macklin, Ernest, 209, 340, 353, 354, 361.
 Magdalen College, Oxford, 33.
 Maidenhead, 93.
 Manisty, Hon. Sir Henry (Lord Justice), 12.
 Margaret Street, 81.
 Marine Hotel, Worthing, 60.
 Marlborough School, 73, 98, 280, 336, 347, 350.
 — Street Police Court, 1, 4, 6, 99,* 373.

Marling, Arthur (*alias* Goff), 99,* 100*, 282, 359, 360.
 Marylebone, 180.
 Mason, Charles, 153, 179, 189, 199, 209, 281, 338, 351-353, 361, 420; letter to Alfred Taylor, 361.
 — Stuart, 48.*
 Mathews, Charles Willie, 16, 56,* 117, 123, 127, 128, 159, 185, 186, 191, 242, 319, 320, 332, 396.
 — ELKIN, 100,* 172, 243, 390, 391.
 — (Elkin) and John Lane, 58, 62,* 99, 100,* 167, 197, 210, 235, 243, 303, 381, 385, 390.
 MAVOR, SIDNEY, 63, 72, 73, 85, 86, 88, 149, 153, 155-157, 173, 175, 177, 178, 180, 192, 196, 197, 200, 213, 219, 227, 277, 293, 311, 315, 316, 332, 353, 360, 420, 421; gives evidence, 233, 234.
 " Mercure de France," 42.*
 Meredith, George, 387.
 Metropole Hotel, Brighton, 425.
 Meunier, *in re*, 408, 409.*
 Michelangelo, 271.
 Midland Hotel, 321.
 "Miscellanies" by Oscar Wilde, 112.*
 MIGGE, ANTONIO, 88, 120, 288, 306, 382, 405, 430, 431; gives evidence, 157, 245, 361.
 Monckton, John Lionel Alexander, 22, 117.
 Monte Carlo, 41, 207, 230.
 Montgomery, Alfred, 93.
 Moore, Sir John Voce, 187, 329, 331.
 Morgan, Walter Vaughan, 15, 22, 187, 329, 331.
 Morrell, Police-Constable, 373.

N

New Bond Street: *see* Bond Street.

New Inn, Edgware Road, 360.*
 New York, 100.*
 Newdigate Prize Poem, 33.
 Newton, Arthur John Edward, 160, 162-164, 166, 169, 170, 175-178, 182, 183.
 — Robert Milnes, 1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14.
 Nice, 218, 230, 231.
 Norfolk Street, Strand, 7, 129.
 North Kensington (Notting Hill), 233.
 Northumberland Avenue, Charing Cross, 230.
 Northumberland Mansions, Northumberland Street, W., 340, 341.

O

Old Bailey (Central Criminal Court), 6, 14-16, 22, 56,* 69, 127, 128, 131, 149, 163, 165, 167, 174, 176, 181, 183-185, 220, 248, 295, 330, 336, 349, 350, 373, 378, 407, 464-466.
 Old Court, 22, 330.
 Olympia, 352.
 Osnaburgh Street, 227, 228, 233, 305.
 Oxford, 8, 24, 28*, 31-33, 41, 44, 57, 86, 91, 92, 106, 224, 264, 268, 393, 429, 431.

P

"Pall Mall Gazette, The," 169.*
 Paris, 66, 67, 82-84, 88-90, 165-167, 169, 190, 206, 217, 226, 228, 236, 275, 304-306, 357, 384, 415, 419, 455, 459, 466; Boulevard des Capucines, 66, 82, 165, 226, 304; Café Julien, 83, 165, 226; Dalziel's Agency, 82; Grand Hotel, 83, 165; Moulin Rouge, 82, 105, 226, 227, 304.
 Park Walk, Chelsea, 80, 149, 169, 170, 199, 205, 209, 310, 383, 401, 411, 426, 456.

PARKER, CHARLES, 64, 65, 74-81, 89, 99,* 100,* 103, 110, 118-121, 142-144, 150, 151, 166,* 169-171, 182, 189, 191, 195-197, 210, 216, 221, 225, 275, 277, 281, 286, 288, 289, 291, 297, 303, 307-310, 312, 322, 323, 332, 336, 337, 339, 342, 345, 346, 350, 352-354, 357-359, 363, 365-368, 372, 380, 383, 391-393, 397, 400-403, 415, 420, 421, 423-426, 431-434, 438, 442-444, 448, 452, 455, 460, 461, 465; gives evidence, 145-150, 178, 179, 197-207, 337-342, 394-395; his arrest: *see* Fitzroy Square and Street.

— WILLIAM, 64, 78, 143, 145, 166,* 182, 189, 191, 195-197, 216, 281, 282, 286, 291, 308, 310, 312, 323, 332, 336, 338, 346, 350, 353, 354, 356-359, 363, 366-370, 383, 423, 424, 442, 452; gives evidence, 150, 151, 179, 207, 208, 342, 343, 397.

Pascal's: *see* Paris, Grand Hotel.

Pater, Walter Horatio, 46, 97, 263.

Paul before Agrippa, Wilde's speech compared with that of, 272.

Pavilion, The, 149, 200, 206, 357, 425.

Pea, *alias* of William Allen.

Pentonville, 466.

PERKINS, ANNIE, 245, 458; gives evidence, 172, 246, 401.

Perks, Walter: *see* Ward, Perks and McKay.

Phillips, Benjamin Faudel, 15, 22.

— Francis Robert Middleton, 16, 188, 329.

— George Faudel, 187, 329.

"Phrases and Philosophies for the Use of the Young," 18, 20, 31, 44, 112, 264, 299.

300; Oscar Wilde cross-examined on, 44-46.

Piccadilly, 7, 38, 39, 41, 119, 151, 234, 281, 309, 357, 373, 375.

— Circus, 337.

“ Picture of Dorian Gray, The,” 18, 20, 31, 32, 40, 59, 97, 111, 112, 124, 236, 255, 259, 263, 265, 269, 298, 299, 385; Oscar Wilde cross-examined on, 46-51; Sir Edward Clarke defends, 263, 264.

Pimlico, 84, 172, 228, 230, 241, 246.

Platonic love described by Oscar Wilde, 271, 272, 279, 280.

Poe, Edgar Allan, 389.*

Poems by Lord Alfred Douglas, 41, 42, 111, 269-271, 279, 284, 285, 300, 301; quoted, 270, 271.

“ Poems” by Oscar Wilde, 33, 168, 235.

Police-Constable 396A, 218, 241, 242.

— 500A, 241.

Pollock, Sir Charles Edward (Baron Pollock), 319-321, 329.

Portland Place, 95.

“ Portrait of Mr. W. H., The,” 62.

Portsmouth, 61.

Pound, John, 15.

Preston, John Watson, 90, 99.*

Preston, near Brighton, 280, 350.

PRICE, THOMAS, 171, 225, 337, 383, 402, 460.

“ Priest and the Acolyte, The,” 18, 31, 40, 42, 43, 46, 107, 111, 259, 264, 270, 300; authorship repudiated by Oscar Wilde, 42-44.

“ Promise of May, The,” 29.

Putney, 355.

Q

Queensberry, Marchioness of, 24, 93, 95, 265, 412, 414.

Queensberry, Marquis of, 170, 201, 224, 233, 236, 247, 259, 265, 278, 291, 293, 300, 349-351, 378, 403, 411, 412, 415, 419, 427, 432, 433,* 438, 441, 445, 448, 451, 465; acquitted on charge of libelling Oscar Wilde, 126, 274; charged at Marlborough Street, 1-3, 4-14, 373-377; his interview with Oscar Wilde, 37; leading article on, 132; letters from, 91-96, 105, 106, 265; statements issued to the Press, 134.

Queen's Bench Division, Case in, 409.*

Queen's Gate Hall, 352.

R

Read, Henry A., 22, 126, 192, 250, 312, 332, 380, 461.

Reading, 180.

— Prison, 466.

Recorder of London: *see* Sir Charles Hall.

Regent Street, Chelsea, 99,* 359, 391.

— W., 24, 81, 174.

Regent's Park, 233.

Regina v. Carden, 12.

— Meunier, 408, 409.

— Owen, 193.

— Page, 193.

— Queensberry, 149, 152, 165, 167,* 174, 180, 183, 189, 215, 238, 245-248, 250-252, 262, 266, 268, 273, 274, 297, 298, 388, 402-404, 407, 415, 416, 419, 430, 438, 445, 448.

Reid, Sir Robert Threshie, Q.C., M.P., 129.

Renals, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph, 15, 22, 187, 191, 329, 330.

RICHARDS, CHARLES, 132, 133, 172, 173, 237, 247, 402.

Ritchie, James Thomson, 15, 187, 329.

Robertson, *alias* of Cliburn.

ROBINSON, CHARLES, 180, 243, 397, 398.

Rochester Row Police Station, 218, 219, 229, 241-243, 305.

Rosebery, Earl of, 17, 68, 94.

Royal Academy, 401.

RUMSBY, LUCY, 149, 200, 411, 442; gives evidence, 169, 209, 210, 402.

Rupert Street, 54, 154, 198, 207, 211, 382.

Russell, Earl, 188.

——— Hon. Charles, 5, 16, 129, 130, 131, 149, 156, 163, 170, 201, 202, 234, 445; *see also* Day, Russell and Co.

S

Sackville Street, 392.

St. Denis, *alias* of Atkins.

St. Helen's Gardens, 233.

St. James's, 281.

——— Park, 133.

——— Place, 41, 65, 67, 78, 84, 85, 90, 149, 171, 196, 200, 205, 225, 227, 268, 275, 310, 337, 360, 383, 402, 414, 425, 460, 461.

——— Restaurant, 78, 143, 145, 147, 150, 197, 207, 210, 281, 308, 309, 337-339, 354, 356, 357, 359.

——— Street, 149.

——— Theatre, 17, 29, 30, 135, 227, 387, 402.

St. Pancras, 321.

St. Paul's, 306.

——— Churchyard, 90.

Salisbury, 24, 53, 54, 307, 418, 428.

"Salome," 82,* 101.

Samuel, Marcus, 16, 22, 187, 329.

SAUNDERS, ALICE, gives evidence, 397.

Savory, Sir Joseph, Bart., M.P., 15.

Savoy Hotel, 38, 39, 41, 51, 53, 64, 65, 71, 74, 78, 88, 93, 103, 108, 114, 120, 121, 142-144, 148, 157, 163, 172, 180, 196, 199, 204, 243, 245, 272, 275, 278, 288, 301, 302, 306, 310, 312, 322, 336, 338, 344, 345, 357, 365, 382, 383, 385, 394, 396, 399, 400, 404, 418, 424, 425, 429, 430, 442, 446, 449, 452, 457, 460, 461.

Scarborough, 218, 231.

Scarf, Ernest, 67, 85, 90, 110, 118, 149, 171, 201, 225, 278, 360, 426.

Schwab, Maurice, 165, 217, 225, 227, 233, 275, 304, 305, 355, 360, 420, 427, 430.

Scotland, 94.

Scotland Yard, 130, 131, 133, 172, 173, 241, 247, 320, 401, 402.

"Scots Observer, The," 51,* 97, 255.

Scott, Sir Walter, 209.

Scotts (1, Old Bond Street), 373.

Shakespeare, 49, 51, 62, 271, 416.

SHELLEY, EDWARD, 22, 58, 59, 99, 100,* 101, 102, 172, 180, 196, 197, 210, 243, 245, 274, 275, 284, 286-288, 293, 294, 302-304, 312, 322, 332, 380, 381, 403, 405, 406, 460, 461, 465; gives evidence, 167-169, 235-240, 384-390; his letters 275, 386-389, 406. to Oscar Wilde, 238, 239.

Sheppard, Superintendent Charles W., 99,* 100.*

Sheriffs of the City of London: *see* Marcus Samuel and George Hand.

Sherriff, Charles Thomas, 376.

Simonds, John Addington, 444.*

"Sinner's Comedy, The," 59.

Skindles, 93.

Sloane Street, 128, 129, 132, 141, 172, 247, 402.

Soho, 358.
 Solferino Restaurant, 73, 80, 147, 149, 198, 207, 309.
 Solicitor-General: *see* Sir Frank Lockwood.
 Southsea, 172, 401.
 Speaker, The, 136.
 "Sphinx, The," 101, 389.*
 "Spirit Lamp, The," 27, 28,* 36, 57.
 "Standard, The," 112.*
 Stephenson, *alias* of Cliburn.
 Stewart, Francis and Co., 46.
 Old Bond Street, and 57.
 Piccadilly, 373.
 Stoneham, Sydney Dick, 373, 377.
 Sutton, Henry, 331, 349.

T

Tachbrook Street, 219, 228, 229, 241, 242.
 Tankard —, 278, 279.
 TAYLOR, ALFRED WATERHOUSE SOMERSET, 34, 54, 55, 63, 64-66, 70, 72-81, 85, 89, 90, 98-100, 109, 110, 119, 143-145, 149, 153, 154, 156, 163, 164, 166, 167, 170, 173, 176, 185, 207-209, 224-226, 232-235, 244, 245, 247, 254, 255, 257, 259, 267, 274, 276, 278, 283, 288, 291, 292, 307, 308, 311, 312, 322, 323, 333, 337, 340, 342, 343, 345, 346, 375, 382, 383, 391, 394, 397, 401, 403, 419-424, 426, 428, 430, 438, 439, 444, 445, 448, 456; at the Old Bailey, 187, 191, 214, 220, 244, 308, 329, 335, 349, 366, 369; charged at Bow Street, 146, 160, 176; his arrest, 145, 173, 246, 298; his rooms described, 71, 151-153, 172-174, 196, 208, 200, 246, 247, 276, 277, 300, 345, 347, 364, 365, 420, 424; in the witness-box, 280-283, 350-362; speeches for his defence, 291, 292, 363, 364; verdict and sentence, 360, 370, 379, 462-464.
 Taylor, George Paul, 392.
 — Henry, 350.
 Telegrams, 64, 73, 74, 92, 100,* 113, 155, 337, 344, 357, 375, 382.
 Tennyson, Lord, 29.
 Tett, Walter, 374.
 Thames Embankment, 53, 418, 458.
 Thornhill, Walter and Co., 86, 174, 243.
 Thornton, James, 28.*
 "Three Men in a Boat," 175.
 Thurr —, 203.
 Tidy, Harman Edgar, 392.
 Tite Street, 7, 24, 33, 41, 53, 65, 84, 89, 109, 144, 149, 154, 170, 196, 211, 212, 223, 227, 238, 268, 276, 305, 307, 336, 382, 406, 415, 452, 453, 461.
 Tivoli, The, 355.
 "To-day," 175.
 Torquay, 34, 41, 51, 154, 416, 425.
 Tottenham Court Road Police Station, 99.*
 Trafalgar Square, 149, 200, 383, 424.
 Tree, Henry Beerbohm, 26, 35, 58, 74, 113, 114, 180, 337, 357, 446.
 Treloar, Sir George Robert, 329, 331.
 Trinity College, 33, 268.
 Truscott, George Wyatt, 35.
 Tyler, Charles Ernest, 37*
 — Sir George Robert, Bart., 329, 331.
 Tyser, William, 3.

U

University College, 447.*
 Upper Bedford Place, 321.
 Upper Islington, 391.

V

Vaughan, James, 321.

Verdicts: Queensberry, 126; Taylor, 366; Wilde, 461; Wilde and Taylor, 314. Vexatious Indictments Act. 9. Vezin, Hermann, 29. Victoria, 165, 166, 226.

— Hotel, 230. Queen, 9, 94, 135, 142. Street, 355.

Vigo Street, 58, 167, 172, 235, 381, 388, 390.

Vine Street Police Station, 3, 373, 374.

VOGEL, ALOYS LOUIS, 171, 243, 391.

W

Wandsworth Prison, 466. Ward, Samuel: *see* Ward, Perks and McKay.

Ward, Perks and McKay, 135. Warton, Charles Nicholas, M.P., 136.

Watson, *alias* of Burton, 231. Westminster, 143, 151, 218, 336, 359, 382.

— Abbey, 424. White, Charles, 321.

Whitehall, 130. Wilde, Mrs. Oscar, 2, 92, 102, 122, 268.

OSCAR FINGALL O'FLAHERTIE WILLS, charges Lord Queensberry with libel, 1, 4.; gives evidence against him at the police court, 5, 7-13; at the Old Bailey, 33-40; is cross-examined by Mr. Carson, 40-62, 70-90; date of his birth, 40; submits to an adverse verdict, 126; writes to the Press, 130; is arrested, 133, 172, 173, 247, 298, 402; charged at Bow Street, 141, 160, 176; committed for trial, 183; bail applied for, 158, 172, 175, 183, 317, 319-321, 335, 436; postponement of trial applied for, 185, 335, 370; tried with Taylor at the Old Bailey, 187, 191, 214, 220, 244, 258, 295; goes into the witness-box, 267-270.

414-431; the jury disagree, 313; released on bail, 321; tried again at the Old Bailey, 378; is found guilty, 461; sentenced, 463, 464; serves his sentence, is released, and dies, 466. Wilde, Sir William Robert, 24, 33.

Willis's Rooms, 104.

Wills, Hon. Sir Alfred, 320-331, 350, 360, 378, 379, 395, 404-407, 409, 437-441; sums up the case of Taylor, 366-368; sums up the case of Wilde, 447-459.

Wisden, Frederick, 376.

Witnesses (not including police, detectives, etc.): Applegate, Atkins, Bancroft, Becker, Brooks, Claridge, Cotter, Grant, Gray, Leith, Mathews, Mavor, Migge, Parker (Charles), Parker (William), Perkins, Price, Robinson, Rumsby, Saunders, Shelley, Vogel, Wood, Wright.

Wokingham, 24.

WOOD, ALFRED, 17, 21, 25, 34, 35, 54, 55, 63, 64, 70, 72, 89, 102, 103, 112, 113, 115, 118, 140, 189, 196, 197, 201, 202, 205, 207, 209, 215, 216, 276, 277, 279, 286, 288, 289, 297, 303, 307, 308, 312, 315, 316, 322, 332, 337, 339, 344, 360, 368, 370, 372, 380-382, 391, 395, 403, 406, 407, 420, 427-429, 431-434, 442-445, 448-454, 460, 461, 465; gives evidence, 153-155, 174, 190, 191, 210-213, 221-225, 343, 344, 391-394.

Worthing, 22, 24, 34, 60, 102, 110, 118, 121, 278, 425, 426, 443.

"Wreck of the Grosvenor, The," 61.

WRIGHT, SIDNEY, 2, 7, 11, 18, 33, 274.

